



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2009

No. 105

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

THE ECONOMIC CASE FOR CLEAN ENERGY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I rise today to reemphasize the economic need for the American Clean Energy and Security Act. I proudly supported the energy bill's recent passage here in the House because I know that in addition to protecting our environment and providing for greater national security, it will also control spiraling energy costs and create American clean energy jobs.

Our friends on the other side have attempted to obfuscate the issue by labeling the landmark legislation as a tax bill. They have even cited a study claiming a precise-sounding figure, and at first their mistake perhaps could be forgiven. Perhaps they simply didn't understand the study they cited.

However, Professor John Reilly of MIT, one of the authors of that very study, sent a letter to minority leader JOHN BOEHNER stating that the Republican citation was simply not correct, given the study's data.

That letter was dated April 1. Yet, our friends on the other side persist in using this inaccurate figure. Madam Speaker, I'm here to set the record straight.

Shall we talk about increasing energy prices? How about a \$700 energy increase on every American household

if we don't take action. This isn't a tax. This is the cost of doing nothing. This is more than a \$700 increase each year that has already occurred in this decade due to rising electricity and gasoline prices.

Of course, the costs could be much higher if we used last year's \$4 a gallon cost during the summer. However, even using the current price of \$2.59, the average yearly per capita increase in gasoline costs this decade has been more than \$400 per household. Excluding last year's \$4 a gallon cost, the price of a gallon of gasoline this decade has doubled—from \$1.26 a gallon in 2000, to \$2.59 currently.

Since 2000, the price of electricity in the United States increased more than 38 percent, thereby pushing the average yearly household bill from \$800 to \$1,100 a year.

We know that we send hundreds of billions of dollars each year to foreign countries to import oil. The U.S. imports roughly 9.4 million barrels of oil every day. That equates to more than \$230 billion every year—\$230 billion we could be reinvesting in our economy—creating American energy jobs—rather than sending it overseas, often to countries that view us as a meal ticket at best, or an enemy at worst.

Madam Speaker, we have also heard from the other side that the American Clean Energy and Security Act would eliminate jobs. Perhaps they don't realize that the current system of energy generation is already costing us thousands of jobs.

For instance, the U.S. Department of Labor states that employment in the mining industry will decline every year through at least 2014. This isn't recession related. This is simply an industry in decline. If we do nothing, more Americans will lose their jobs.

We know the cost of doing nothing—continuing increases in energy costs and continuing job losses—costs American families can no longer afford.

However, with the American Clean Energy and Security Act, we will create jobs—green jobs—here in America. The Act will create incentives for American companies to innovate and to expand their investment in alternative sources of energy.

Madam Speaker, we know we can generate American jobs in the renewable energy sector if we just make the investment. From 2000 to 2008, for example, the wind power industry alone—before the passage of this bill—created 35,000 jobs. Of course, wind energy still makes up only a small percentage of electricity generation—less than 1 percent.

Imagine if we could make a concerted effort for renewable energy. We could greatly expand those gains and create hundreds of thousands of American clean energy jobs.

Madam Speaker, the business community understands the importance of energy reform. Companies like eBay, Nike, Starbucks, Levi Strauss, the Gap, Symantec, and Sun Microsystems have formed the Business for Climate and Innovative Energy Policy Coalition to advocate for these clean energy jobs and for this bill. These businesses support reducing greenhouse gas pollution, establishing a renewable energy standard, and investing in job creation. They know that if we do nothing, the costs associated with continued global warming will reach \$271 billion by 2025.

America has always been the land of innovation. However, as we recently have seen in the automotive industry, we cannot rest on past laurels. There are costs to doing nothing.

I commend my colleagues in the House for the support of the bill. Together, we have made a statement that will address rising energy costs; we will wean America off its dangerous dependence on foreign oil; and we will work to avoid the catastrophic costs of global warming; and create American jobs. I hope the Senate will act swiftly.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8027

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RACKS UP RECORD-BREAKING \$1 TRILLION DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DeGETTE). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. My colleague from Virginia promises jobs from the cap-and-tax bill. If you believe that, then you probably believe the Democrats when they promised that the stimulus bill would provide jobs.

The Obama administration and congressional Democrats promised that their trillion-dollar stimulus would create jobs immediately and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. But since the stimulus bill passed, 1.96 million Americans have lost their jobs. I suspect that we'll do a lot worse than that under their cap-and-tax bill.

Let me fill you in on some of the economic statistics that we have right now. At the beginning of July, our national debt clocked in at \$11.5 trillion. If you don't have a calculator in hand, that's \$37,609.23 for every man, woman, and child in America.

But the real news is not simply that the national debt is more than \$11.5 trillion. The real news is the Treasury Department announced yesterday that for the first time the Federal budget deficit has topped \$1 trillion. The first time in our history.

To clarify, the deficit is different than the debt in the sense that the deficit generally refers to the amount of overspending in a given year. That means so far in fiscal year 2009, the Federal Government has spent \$1 trillion more than it has collected in taxes.

Rather than trim our budget and make do with less, like the rest of America, Congress has decided to up the ante and will not just maintain current government spending levels, but will significantly increase spending in the coming year.

This kind of runaway spending is part of why we're hearing reports that our \$1 trillion deficit is just the beginning of the story. In fact, some experts are predicting that the deficit could reach \$2 trillion this fall.

What do these record deficits mean for Americans? Massive deficits can only continue for so long. I think we've all heard stories of how crushing debt has forced some businesses or families into bankruptcy. At some point, the pile of cards is coming down, either as the interest rates on the debt spirals up higher, or as those who lend to America run out of cash to loan or simply out of patience for Uncle Sam's spendthrift ways. The American people are hurting. Millions are out of work, and hundreds of thousands lose their jobs each month.

The government spent \$18 billion in June just to pay the interest on the national debt, which works out to \$600 million a day in interest payments. Eventually, American families are going to have to foot this bill.

American people know we cannot borrow and spend our way back to a growing economy. As a record-breaking \$1 trillion deficit causes the national debt to increase at an historic pace, Congress will either have to slash spending in unprecedented ways or raise taxes. And judging by how the current Democrat majority in Congress has proceeded thus far, I'm very skeptical about any meaningful spending cuts. You can probably guess what that means. Let's just say that the tax hike forecast doesn't look good for the American people.

Democrats are on the side of more government and more taxes. Republicans are on the side of the American people.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. One issue that is too often out of sight and out of mind is the quality and the condition of our drinking water and wastewater pipes under the ground.

Just 6 months ago, we all watched in shock as rescue workers airlifted people from vehicles caught in a massive rush of water caused by a water main rupture on River Road just outside of Washington, D.C., because of the failure of a single, corroded pipe installed over 40 years ago. In fact, 72,000 miles of sewer main and water pipe are over 80 years of age.

This morning, there was a water main break that closed 23rd Street at I, near the George Washington Hospital.

The EPA estimates that American communities suffered more than 240,000 water main breaks last year. Combined with overflowing combined sewer systems causing contamination, property damage, disruption in water supply and, often, massive traffic jams.

The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates an average of 6 billion gallons of water is lost every day through leakage—enough to fill over 9,000 Olympic-sized swimming pools. The Engineers have given our Nation's drinking water and wastewater infrastructure a D-minus grade in their most recent report—sadly, a grade that was not improved over the report from 5 years ago.

The House of Representatives recognized the need to upgrade water infrastructure earlier this year, passing H.R. 1262, the Water Quality Investment Act, which would update and reauthorize Clean Water State Revolving Loan Funds. But they simply don't have enough money.

The EPA's most recent estimate is there is an over \$500 billion gap between current investment and projected needs over the next 20 years. Surface and air transportation infrastructure, while facing their own challenges, at least have a dedicated source of funding. Water does not.

In the spring of 2005, the famous Republican pollster, Frank Luntz, released a poll that showed Americans would support a sustainable, dedicated source of water funding for infrastructure.

□ 1045

He found the public sees clean water as an even higher priority than investments made in transportation and airways—71 percent prioritized water above other infrastructure. It is time to stop talking about it and do something: creating a dedicated firewall trust fund for water infrastructure.

This afternoon, I will introduce legislation to create this trust fund financed by a number of funding mechanisms that are simple, equitable and adequate for \$10 billion a year. The Water Protection and Reinvestment Act will establish a trust fund to finance clean water and drinking water infrastructure. Most of the money will go through the State revolving funds for sewage and drinking water improvements.

The financing mechanisms in the Water Protection and Reinvestment Act will include a fee based on water-based beverages, products that are disposed of in wastewater, pharmaceutical products, and corporate profits. These fees would be assessed at the manufacturer level so they will be easy to administer and will have a minimal impact on the consumer. They will be at a level that is so low that it would not place the entire burden on any one industry or group of consumers. With a mix of funding, everyone will contribute to a solution from which everyone will benefit from.

I am pleased that the legislation already has a diverse support of stakeholders from the Associated General Contractors, American Rivers, the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, and Rural Community Assistance Partnership, and a wide range of bipartisan original cosponsors, including Congressmen NORM DICKS, STEVE LATOURETTE, MICHAEL SIMPSON, and THOMAS PETRI, representing a base of support from thoughtful, bipartisan legislators.

While the funding question is always complicated, the public is with us. In January of this year, pollster Frank Luntz released a new poll—and remember, he is the famous Republican pollster—finding that a nearly unanimous 94 percent of Americans are concerned about the state of our Nation's infrastructure. He found that this concern cuts across all regions of the country: urban, rural, suburban. He found that 84 percent of the public wants the Federal Government to spend more money to improve infrastructure, and that 81 percent of Americans are personally prepared to pay 1 percent more in taxes for the cause.

The need is clear. The public is supportive. My hope is that my colleagues will join me in a solution that will

make all of our communities more livable, and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT STEVE HOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHILDERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an American hero, a Mississippi hero, Master Sergeant Steve Hood of the Mississippi Highway Patrol. On May 29 of this year, Master Sergeant Hood of Guntown, Mississippi, died in the line of duty, the first in a decade. A 28-year veteran State trooper, he passed before his time.

Master Sergeant Hood started his career as a State trooper in 1982 after graduating from the Mississippi Highway Patrol Academy. It was clear when I attended his funeral last month, he was a man who brought comfort and friendship to all he met.

Along with his dedicated service to the people of Mississippi, family and friends will remember him as a Christian who was actively involved in Harrisburg Baptist Church and one who enjoyed singing. Just last year, Master Sergeant Hood returned to duty after recovering from a near-fatal tractor accident that reaffirmed and strengthened his faith.

Master Sergeant Hood was a devoted husband to his wife, Lisa, and a loving father to his children, Matthew, Stacie and Stephanie, and a loyal colleague of his fellow troopers.

Please join me today in remembering the life of Master Sergeant Steve Hood and mourning his death. I thank my colleagues for honoring this Mississippi and American hero, Master Sergeant Steve Hood, and his family at this time.

ENSURE BROADCAST FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, the American people love a fair fight; and so do I, especially where the issues of the day are being debated. In a free market, though, fairness should always be determined based upon the equality of opportunity, not equality of results. Everyone should, in effect, have a chance to make their case.

That's why it is so disturbing to many of us that some of the leading voices in Congress over the last 2 years have been calling for Congress to enforce an idea of fairness on the airwaves of America in the form of restoring the so-called fairness doctrine. But our Nation should always proceed with caution whenever some would achieve fairness by limiting the fairness of others.

The American people cherish their freedom. It is, in effect, a blood-bought

right. There is totality of agreement on this floor about that. In fact, I believe that is why President Ronald Reagan repealed the so-called fairness doctrine after it had been in place for almost four decades back in 1987. The fairness doctrine regulated the content of radio for much of the last century, and limited the ability of radio stations to deal with controversial issues without meeting a standard of equal time or balance or record keeping. As a result of that, as many of us old enough to remember will attest, talk radio as we know it today virtually did not exist before 1987.

Well, with some of the talk of restoring the fairness doctrine to the law of the land, Congressman GREG WALDEN of Oregon and I have been working over the last 2 years to ensure broadcast freedom. We have authored the Broadcaster Freedom Act which is cosponsored by every Republican in the House of Representatives. This week we will bring to the floor a broadcaster freedom amendment as part of the Financial Services Appropriations bill. Many who are watching may not know that the Federal Communications Commission receives its entire budget through the Financial Services Appropriations bill, and we believe this is an opportune time, as we were able to do 2 years ago, to use the power of this Congress and the people in this Congress on both sides of the aisle to advocate for the freedom of the airwaves of America by limiting the ability of the Federal Communications Commission to bring back the so-called fairness doctrine.

But first, for the uninformed, the fairness doctrine is something of an Orwellian and Depression-era Federal Communications Commission rule that was devised back in 1949. As I mentioned, it required radio broadcasters to present both sides of an opinion when discussing controversial topics. It put unelected bureaucrats at the FCC in charge of enforcement in determining what speech was legal. Because of lack of clarity in the commission's ruling, broadcasters more often than not opted to offer noncontroversial programs in lieu of hours of paperwork, countless legal fees, and a potential threat to their broadcast license.

Recognizing the chilling effect the regulation was having on broadcast freedom, the FCC began to overturn its own ruling on the fairness doctrine in 1985. Following that change in policy and President Reagan's veto of attempts to reinstate it, the results have been dramatic.

Think about it. Before the fairness doctrine was repealed, there were some 125 talk radio stations in America. Now there are more than 2,000. While names like Limbaugh, Hannity, Laura Ingraham, and other conservative giants are better known to many, the truth is when you look at the totality of the talk radio marketplace, from the local level to the regional level to the national level, there is an extraor-

dinary diversity of opinion. Many progressive, moderate, and liberal programs succeed extraordinarily well at the local level in many markets around the country.

Unfortunately, in spite of this recent history and the breakout of broadcast freedom since 1987, there has been talk in the last several years about the need to level the playing field of radio broadcasting by restoring the fairness doctrine. Let me say from my heart, I believe it is dangerous to suggest that a government bureaucracy would be a competent arbiter of free speech. As a former radio talk show host myself, I know personally what the fairness doctrine meant to radio back in the day, and I know it would ultimately muzzle what is the dynamic public discussion that we call talk radio in America today.

Let me be clear on this. I believe the broadcaster freedom amendment that we will bring this week gives Members of this body an opportunity to say "no" to the fairness doctrine and to say "no" to a new iteration of it that takes the formation of regulations under the rubric of localism, I believe will be met by broad and bipartisan support. If memory serves, 2 years ago when I brought the Pence amendment banning the fairness doctrine from being implemented by the FCC, more than 305 Members of Congress voted for it, including 100 Members of the Democrat majority.

So I urge support for the broadcaster freedom amendment. Join us in embracing freedom on the airwaves of America.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, the events of World War II seem to be lost in translation, interpreted as events that occurred rather than events that affect. For many, the events of the past no longer shape our views of the future. For this reason, I come to the Chamber this morning to speak about an important chapter in American history. A chapter that too few Americans know.

Early this morning, Congressman SABLON and I were joined by the Honorable David Hayes, Deputy Secretary of the Interior, Major General Donald Goldhorn, former Congressman Ben Blaz, Congressman JOE WILSON, and friends of Guam in laying a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington. We honored the soldiers, the sailors, the airmen, the marines, and Coast Guardsmen who participated in the battle in the liberation of Guam and the Northern Marianas during World War II.

Our ceremony also honored the liberated, the Chamorros, the indigenous people of Guam, who remained steadfast in their loyalty to the United

States during the war and who endured enemy occupation.

Tuesday, July 21, 2009, marks the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Guam. Guam was attacked by the Imperial Japanese forces on December 8, 1941, at the same time that Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, was attacked, the different dates owing to the international dateline. Guam was subsequently invaded by the Imperial Japanese forces on December 10, 1941, and occupied until liberation on July 21, 1944.

The story of the people of Guam and the campaign to liberate them from occupation is an American story of courage and sacrifice. It is an important part of American history, and one of pride and determination in the face of overwhelming obstacles, barriers constructed by the Japanese war machine in the form of forced labor, forced marches, internment and public executions, and a true test of loyalty, a test that had not been asked but for a very few civilian communities under the American flag in the 20th century.

So I come to the floor today to bring honor to the Chamorros who were occupied, and to the servicemen who liberated them. The liberation of Guam from enemy occupation during World War II marked a pivotal point in Guam's history and was a key battle for the Allied Forces in ending the war in the Pacific.

The liberation of Guam by the United States Armed Forces from the Imperial Japanese Empire allowed for the first time the installation of air bases that would house land-based aerial bombers, putting them in reach of the main island of Japan. The air offenses launched from the Mariana Islands were effective in subduing the Imperial Japanese war effort, bringing the war to an end and saving the lives of many.

Prior to the Japanese invasion, Guam Armed Forces consisted of 153 marines, 271 U.S. Navy personnel, 134 civilian construction workers, and 247 Chamorro members of the Insular Guard. The Insular Guard protected the community on Guam during the invasion. During the occupation, the Imperial Japanese Forces attempted to turn the Chamorro people against the United States. But the Chamorro people remained steadfastly loyal to the United States through the 32-month occupation.

On the eve of the American landings on the island in 1944, all 22,000 Chamorro inhabitants of Guam were forced to march to Mannengon Hills and other locations to be interned in concentration camps to maintain control of the population in fear of an uprising.

This is a true story of American courage. The Chamorro people of Guam were loyal Americans at the time, and it was the first time that a foreign power invaded U.S. soil since the War of 1812. Despite fear of their captors and their will, the Chamorro people remained steadfast in their loyalty, and were brave in providing aid to the

American soldiers hiding from enemy capture. These acts of courage were punishable by death. Some experienced horrific events, massacres at Malessso' and Tinta and Faha' where Japanese soldiers herded families into caves and threw hand grenades and delivered small arms fire until dozens lay dead. Their loyalty was put to the extreme test of sacrifice.

So as we approach Liberation Day next week on Guam, we remember our elders who lived through the occupation and also the several thousand members of the U.S. Armed Forces who gave their lives while defending and liberating Guam.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, hear the prayers of Your people from across this Nation. Bring the hearts of all believers together in an act of praise and thanksgiving for Your endowment of freedom and the desire to serve You by our work and the compassionate love we show this day.

Make us instruments of peace in the midst of a world filled with suspicion, competition and self-deception.

In us and through us, manifest the gift of reconciliation and solidarity that this Congress may be strong in its purpose to serve the common good of the people and give You the glory You deserve, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PASCRELL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2965. An act to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

ELECTING A MINORITY MEMBER TO A STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 640

Resolved, that the following member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee:

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT—Mr. Harper.

Mr. PENCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CARE

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express how important it is that we pass comprehensive health reform this year that expands health insurance coverage, reins in spending, and is fiscally responsible.

The health reform package that the committees will consider this week shows a genuine commitment to reversing the current unsustainable trends, to providing stability for hard-working Americans, and to being fiscally responsible. There is no question that we must take action and that our actions must be fully paid for. With these ground rules, we face difficult decisions, many of which may not be politically popular, but my colleagues and I on Ways and Means are fully committed to paying for this essential legislation.

Our current path in delivering health care is unsustainable, and I share with you some disturbing figures from my home State of New Jersey that illustrates the point.

New Jerseyans are paying more and getting less. Between 2000 and 2007, the average New Jersey worker's share of family premiums nearly doubled, outpacing the growth in wages nearly five times over.

Mr. Speaker, we must act this week, and we must act with all due resolve.

DO NOT MAKE THE CIA A POLITICAL PINATA

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, now is not the time for us to make a political pinata out of the CIA. How long ago was it that 9/11 occurred? And what did the commission on 9/11 tell us? It said we did not have adequate intelligence. We had lost an entire generation of intelligence operatives as a result of prior action by this Congress.

We can talk about the Church Committee report. We can talk about what happened during the Carter administration. We can talk about what happened in the Clinton administration. We thought we didn't need human intelligence; we could do it all with electronic.

The way to attract people, bright young people, committed patriots, to this country's intelligence is not to go after the CIA, is not, after the fact, for what appears to be political reasons, to threaten criminal investigations of those who are doing nothing more than trying to save this country from attack by others who would try and kill innocent Americans.

This outrage must stop. Do not make the CIA a political pinata, for whatever purpose.

A GOOD DAY TO STAND UP FOR COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, what a glorious day and a great time to be in Congress. We have an opportunity to preside in this 111th Congress when we pass comprehensive health care reform with a public option.

You know, the fact is that millions of Americans are looking forward to the day when they don't have to worry about being excluded for a preexisting condition, when they will have true portability, when we can unlock the true entrepreneurial talent of America because people will be able to go and pursue their entrepreneurial dreams without fear of losing health care.

The fact is the other team, look, they had their day. They tried and all we have gotten is sicker at a higher expense, and we've been dying earlier. We haven't seen better outcomes with status quo health care, and people who stand for the status quo, they have had their shot and their time has run.

So, Mr. Speaker, thank you for presiding today. This is a good day to stand up for comprehensive health care reform and a strong, robust public option.

IN TRIBUTE TO WARREN TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Warren Township, New Jersey, for being named one of Money magazine's top 100 places to live for 2009. Warren Township was ranked sixth in the Nation in the magazine's annual rankings.

Located in the heart of the Watchung Mountains 35 miles west of New York City in Somerset County, New Jersey, Warren Township is not your typical big city suburb. Once described as "the greenest place in New Jersey," Warren Township is home to major corporations like Chubb Insurance and Citigroup. Yet the community retains its rural character through open space and its 72 working farms.

Good schools and family friendly township recreation, among other things, make Warren Township just one of the many great places in New Jersey to live, work and raise a family.

Congratulations to Warren Township. I'm proud to be the township's representative in Washington.

DEFENDING ARIZONA VALUES CAMPAIGN

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, wherever I go in my district, I hear the same thing. Folks feel like greater Arizona's values are not being represented in Washington.

In this historic and challenging time, it is more important than ever for someone to stand up for what is important to us. I am determined to give voice to our values.

Today, I am launching my "Defending Arizona Values" campaign to continue my fight for the ideals I was raised with in rural Arizona. I will take on big government to make it more accountable and responsive to our needs, instead of just offering handouts and weighing us down with bureaucracy. I will also work to preserve our tradition of self-reliance.

As part of this effort, I am proud to announce that I have signed on as a co-sponsor to the Federal Reserve Transparency Act. We need more oversight and accountability in our government, and auditing the Fed is a valuable step in the right direction.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF ALBERTA KINNEY

(Mr. LEE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the life of Alberta Kinney, an Amherst, New York, resident who answered the Nation's call to service during World War II.

In 1944, Alberta became part of the first group of women to fly military aircraft for the United States. The primary mission of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASP as they came to be known, was to fly noncombat military missions so that their male counterparts could be deployed to combat.

The WASP did much more than fulfill wartime needs, overcoming significant hurdles to carry the torch for Amelia Earhart and pass it on to Sally Ride.

Last month, after the President signed into law a measure that honors Alberta and her fellow WASP with a Congressional Gold Medal, it was our hope that she would be able to travel to Washington in the near future to take part in a ceremony commemorating this honor. But sadly, Alberta passed away this past Friday evening.

On behalf of the people of western New York, I extend my deepest sympathies to Alberta's loved ones and ask the House to join me in honoring this distinguished member of the Greatest Generation.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the significance of health care reform for our country and to emphasize the importance of keeping the real VIPs, the people, involved in the process.

Health care reform is evolving rapidly, and I want to ensure that the people back home have real input into what is going on here in Washington, DC.

Earlier this year, I set up a Health Care Advisory Committee, which I meet with every month and which my staff deals with on a daily basis. Members of the advisory committee not only receive the news that's happening here on Capitol Hill with respect to health care, but they actually give us their input of what they're hearing and what they want to see in a health care reform bill. Their expert opinions are so valued in our ability to try to decide what to do here. And next week I will hold a town hall meeting where people back home can come and actually give us their ideas and listen to what is going on here with the development of health care reform.

I encourage all of my colleagues to go home and to hold these types of meetings and to listen to what the people really want.

\$18 MILLION CAN'T BUY CREDIBILITY

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. As some are toasting the success of the so-called stimulus, unemployment rates spiral out of control. Now the White House plans to spend 18 million taxpayer dollars to redesign the Web site that tracks how many jobs have been "saved or created" by the stimulus.

Montanans shouldn't be asked to foot the bill for a Web site that only serves as political damage control for a failing big government policy. We'd rather know the reality on the ground. That's why I launched a Web site that lets my constituents report their experiences with the stimulus. Montana Stimulus Watch didn't cost taxpayers millions of dollars, but it did bring to light that a company had to lay off 24 workers because stimulus dollars went to an out-of-State contractor to pave a Montana road.

I doubt those layoffs will be counted in the slippery "saved or created" formula, but then again, \$18 million can't buy credibility.

WOMEN IMMIGRANTS—THE NEW FACE OF MIGRATION IN AMERICA

(Ms. HIRONO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, today I hosted a panel discussion on the results of a historic poll on women immigrants to America. Today, women comprise half or more of the immigrants entering this country. Women are the new face of migration in America.

Among the findings of this historic poll, many women immigrants acknowledge speaking little or no English, while confronting anti-immigrant discrimination, lack of health care, and low-paying employment, well below the status of the professional work most did in their home countries.

Thirty-eight percent of the women came to join family members; 22 percent to make a better life for their children. Their top two biggest challenges were helping their children achieve success and being able to hold their families together.

The poll data paralleled my mother's own experience in bringing me and my brothers to the United States from Japan in the mid-1950s: her desire to build better futures for us; her early, low-paying, no-benefits jobs; her determination to keep the family together as head of household.

The importance of family to women immigrants is something we can all relate to and support as we discuss and debate immigration reform.

□ 1215

MAYOR FOR A DAY

(Mr. ROSKAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSKAM. A few years ago, my predecessor, Congressman Henry Hyde, started a great program. It was an ini-

tiative to invite young men and women to participate in a civic conversation. It's in Elmhurst, Illinois, and it's a Mayor for a Day program.

I am pleased to announce that Brad Martin of Brian Middle School was the winner of the Mayor for a Day program. I won't read his whole essay. You can go to my Web site and check it out.

But essentially he said that if he were a mayor for a day, he would start a CARE program, which essentially stands for Caring and Respecting Everyone. I think in this day and this age in the 111th Congress, all of us can learn from the wisdom of Brad Martin.

WHEN IS ENOUGH, ENOUGH?

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SPEIER. When is enough enough? AIG is getting ready to pay out more in retention bonuses. This is on top of the \$165 million they paid out in March to the same executives whose credit default swaps and other poorly designed financial products drove the world economy off a cliff.

The only difference is this time around they are trying to get the American people to say that what they're doing is right.

Give me a break.

Taxpayers have already infused \$170 billion into AIG. And where is their break? A teacher in my district gets \$60,000 a year. A bench scientist coming up with a cure for cancer gets maybe \$200,000 a year. An ER doc saving people's lives every single day gets maybe \$350,000 a year.

AIG has asked the administration's compensation czar, Kenneth Feinberg, to sign off on these bonuses—even while acknowledging he has no authority to stop them. Why? Because AIG wants cover.

I urge Mr. Feinberg to reject AIG's request.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA SIGNS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing the Feds are really good at, it's wasting money. And thanks to the so-called stimulus bill, there are billions of citizen dollars floating around loose being blown by the wastecrats.

In a report released last week by the Government Accountability Office, we found out that the money is not being used to create permanent jobs in the private sector as it was intended. It's actually being used to pay for overspending in State budgets and expand government bureaucracy.

In some States, Mr. Speaker, they're erecting signs to try to convince people that the government stimulus boondoggle is a success. Here's one of those signs. This sign is being posted where

no construction has actually started—and the signs cost \$2,000 in Pennsylvania and New York. New Jersey pays \$3,000 for a sign like this. Who's making these signs—Michelangelo?

When Big Government is in charge of the job creation business instead of private industry, it's easier to create million-dollar public relations propaganda signs than it is to create real jobs.

And that's just the way it is.

HEALTH CARE

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we're closing in on a moment in American history that has taken over 70 years to reach. In the mid-1930s, Franklin Delano Roosevelt considered a proposal that would extend health care coverage to every American. But he withdrew the idea because the political will was not up to the challenge at the time. But times have changed.

President Obama has called on the Congress to pass comprehensive health care reform legislation—and he has the support of the American people behind him, especially the middle class.

There are countless facts and figures to support his effort. There are maps, there are charts, there are all kinds of spread sheets, but there is one fact that stands out above all others: Every American today either faces his or her own health care crisis or knows someone who is.

When Americans play by the rules but see their economic lives threatened and destroyed because of their medical expenses, America must change. We are at the crossroads of providing a fair deal for the American people. But we cannot take progress for granted. Times like this don't come along very often. We cannot afford to let this one fall short.

CONGRATULATING MS. SUSAN LEWIS ON 45 YEARS OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. I rise today to honor Ms. Susan Lewis, who spent her life in the classroom devoting her time to educating our youth. Ms. Lewis is retiring from 45 years of teaching. More than 30 of those years were spent at Coleman Junior High in Van Buren, Arkansas, teaching algebra.

Coleman Junior High will undoubtedly be losing an amazing individual who contributed to the lives of two generations of Arkansans. Her time in the classroom provided her students the necessary tools for building a brighter future.

Ms. Lewis exemplifies the idea that with good teachers there is improved student achievement. Her hard work and dedication made her a model for

success for students and her coworkers. We are blessed to have had such a caring teacher as Ms. Lewis. I commend her for her service as well as her good work and wish her continued success in future endeavors.

I ask my colleagues today to join with me in honoring Ms. Lewis, a wonderful teacher who has always and will be dedicated to the students of the Third District of Arkansas.

HEALTH CARE CHOICE FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Private health insurance companies have two-thirds of all Americans that have insurance enrolled in their plans, and they pay one-third of the overall costs for health care in this country. Two-thirds of that cost is borne by the American taxpayer and the working middle class of this country.

You will hear in the next few days a lot of harping about the cost of health care reform for this Nation. I think the only way—and I believe sincerely—to reduce health care costs, bring private insurance companies under control by having a competitive plan, is to have a public option.

A public option does not deny people health care because of preexisting conditions—a public option in the free marketplace that competes with private insurance, and a public option that extends health benefits and opportunities to all Americans.

If we are going to do health reform right, we must provide competition for public insurance, and we must provide opportunity and choice for the American people.

THE WOMEN'S FUND OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. The Women's Fund of Miami-Dade County is a catalyst for social change and economic justice, assisting women to reach their full potential. Together with the Research Institute on Social and Economic Policy at Florida International University, the Women's Fund published a report entitled: Portrait of Women's Economic Security in Greater Miami, which reflects the dire economic situation facing women.

More than half of working women do not earn adequate income to cover their most basic necessities. Eighty-six percent of single mothers do not have enough income to be self-sufficient. Nearly 20 percent of women who work are underemployed. And only one-fourth of women have a retirement or pension plan.

The numbers in these categories are even lower than the national average

but reflect the problem of women across the country.

Here in Congress I work to empower women to be self-sufficient and support policies that enhance women's economic security, including legislation to provide paid parental leave to Federal employees.

I will continue to work for south Florida women by promoting initiatives that protect the rights of women across the Nation.

HEALTH CARE CRISIS ALSO AN ECONOMIC CRISIS

(Mr. DRIEHAUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, until we fix health care in this country, families and small businesses will bear a heavier and heavier financial burden that will slow economic recovery and stifle growth and investment.

In Ohio, health care costs for small businesses have grown 30 percent in recent years. Employer coverage across the State has declined, so that now less than half of all small businesses offer health care coverage benefits to their employees.

The average Ohio family that does receive health care coverage from their employer pays nearly \$13,000 in premiums every year. And because more than 1 in 10 Ohioans lives without any health insurance, Ohio's economy loses between \$3.5 billion and \$7 billion every year due to lost productivity.

The health care crisis is an economic crisis, and part of fixing our economy is ensuring that every single American has quality, affordable health care. The status quo is no longer tolerable for Ohio and no longer tolerable for America.

AMERICANS DESERVE A BETTER SOLUTION

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the trillion-dollar stimulus bill produced by the Obama administration and congressional Democrats is not working. Unemployment is nearing double digits—and rising. Americans are hurting as they struggle to find work and pay the bills. So, what's next?

Despite all the broken promises, now the liberals want to meddle with the health care system and spend another trillion dollars. For their plan to work, Democrats are proposing tax hikes on everything from small businesses to the elimination of the tax deduction for charitable contributions to tax hikes on your favorite soft drink at the convenience store.

Americans deserve a better solution. House Republicans have a plan that won't bankrupt us or increase private insurance rates. In fact, the Republican plan will reduce health care costs, expand access, increase the quality of

care for Americans. Most importantly, the plan ensures that medical decisions are made by patients and their doctors—not government bureaucrats.

The Democrat's government-run health care program is the wrong decision for America. Let's support the plan that offers Americans the freedom and choices they deserve without strangling future generations with insurmountable debt.

MEANINGFUL REFORM NEEDED

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Health Subcommittee I have been a strong supporter of meaningful health care reform, including a robust public health insurance option.

But there's a problem with the plan that's on the table because it incorporates a Medicare reimbursement system that isn't fair. And all you have to do is look at States like Iowa and Minnesota, which consistently rank in the top five in terms of quality patient outcomes and in the bottom five in Medicare reimbursement. Or look at the State of Louisiana, where we spend more per Medicare patient than any other State, and Louisiana is ranked 50th in objective patient outcome measurements.

That system is flawed. When you base the public health insurance option on Medicare plus 5 percent, you perpetuate an inefficient system.

Medical economists will tell you the most effective way to take this head on is to address the problem of over-utilization in geographic parts of the country which waste money and result in poor patient outcomes.

Unless we incorporate those incentives into this public option and address this problem with Medicare, we will never have meaningful reform.

STIMULUS BILL NOT WORKING

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Will Rogers once said: The opposite of progress is Congress. Watching the debate on the floor today, I start to get a better idea about what he meant.

At a time when our country is facing the worst recession in a quarter of a century, the Democrat majority here in Congress just got done passing a national energy tax that will raise the cost of utilities for every American household. And now they're down here on the floor talking about raising taxes for a government takeover of health insurance. All the while, millions of Americans are out of work, hundreds of thousands of Americans continue to lose their jobs every month.

Now, when this trillion-dollar stimulus bill was passed in February, we

were told that it would create jobs immediately. It would hold unemployment below 8 percent. Well, unemployment is now 9.5 percent. It's the worst in 26 years.

Almost 2 million people have lost their jobs since the so-called stimulus bill passed. And yet, the President just said, It's done its job. This weekend, he said the stimulus was "working exactly as we anticipated."

With all due respect to the President of the United States and my Democrat colleagues, the stimulus bill is not working. And the American people know it. The American people deserve a recovery plan that will create real jobs and real recovery—and that's fiscal discipline in Washington, D.C., and tax relief for working families, small businesses, and family farms.

□ 1230

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, the cost and inefficiency of our health care system is embarrassing. It is the only word. American families pay \$1,100 extra every year through their health insurance premiums to fund care for the patients who are unable to pay their hospital bills. The U.S. meanwhile ranks 42nd in the world in life expectancy, and the overuse of invasive medical procedures is dangerous to many. Unexpected health care expenses is the leading cause of bankruptcy amongst American families.

The system is bankrupting the Government of the United States, of Connecticut and of the other 49 States. We have got to get this reform right. It is critical to American families, to fiscal prudence, and to the future of this country. It won't be easy, but inaction is simply not an option.

CREDIT CARD CONGRESS

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concern about this "credit card Congress." Every problem seems to come with a spending plan, and no amount of money seems to be enough.

The national deficit is our annual discrepancy between tax revenue and public expenditures. We just exceeded the \$1 trillion deficit mark for this year, and we still have a long way to go this year. Our national debt is the cumulative amount of money the American people owe; and over the course of the past Congresses, it, too, has skyrocketed.

As of June 30, the national debt stood at \$11.5 trillion. During the month of June, the national debt increased by over \$223 billion. The government spent

over \$18 billion in interest payments in just the month of June. That is \$600 million a day.

Because the Congress did not have the self-discipline to spend less than it took in, \$600 million of your money is going out the door in interest payments. We can no longer afford to run Congress on a credit card.

H.R. 2738

(Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, during the 4th of July recess, I traveled home to visit with constituents and speak with them about their problems and find ways in which we could help them.

As is often the case, my constituents continue to inspire me with their willingness to take on hard challenges and help their family and neighbors in need. Many throughout my district volunteer their time to drive veterans to medical appointments, even though the drive can last over 3 or 4 hours. It is tough, but oftentimes it is what needs to be done for a veteran needing medical services.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 2738, a bill that would direct the Secretary of the VA to reimburse family caregivers of disabled veterans for travel expenses, including lodging and food, when they take vets for appointments and treatments. Rural veterans face too many obstacles when seeking medical treatment, and I believe this legislation will make their lives a little easier and help get them the care that they need. We made a lot of promises to our veterans, and it's about time we begin to honor them.

I hope that my colleagues will support this very important piece of legislation, and I urge its passage.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as Congress takes on the essential task of strengthening our health care system, we have an extraordinary opportunity here to do something good and right for the American people. While the challenges before us are multiple, shifting the health care paradigm from a system that treats the symptoms of sickness and disease to one that promotes life-long wellness and prevention for all Americans would be a very good and meaningful start.

The current health care debate, which focuses on a loosely defined, government-operated "public option," has yet to address several underlying complexities within our system. But the essential question here is really simple: How do we improve health outcomes and reduce costs while protecting vulnerable persons? A thorough policy de-

bate must be grounded in these cornerstone objectives to effectively improve the quality of and access to health care for all Americans, or else we are simply discussing a new government-financing mechanism without regard to unsustainable cost projections.

RECOGNIZING HARLAN AND CHARLIE STOKES

(Mr. KLINE of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the actions of two brave men from my district, Mr. Harlan Stokes and his son Charlie.

Last August, Harlan, an Eagle Scout himself, and Charlie, who was well on his way to earning his Eagle Scout rank, set out to conquer Longs Peak in the Rocky Mountain National Park. Little did they know they would need all of their scout training before the day was done.

As the two reached the top of the mountain, a powerful storm hit, bringing with it gale-force winds, rain and hail. Harlan and Charlie quickly headed down the mountain; but as they went down, they found other less prepared hikers. Bravely staying to help, they gathered those they had found and ran for shelter in a nearby cave. Over the next 2 hours, the father-son duo selflessly cared for 23 hikers while they themselves began to suffer from hypothermia.

As a result of their courageous actions, all 23 hikers made it off the mountain safely. To honor their heroism, the two were awarded one of the Boy Scouts' most prestigious awards, the National Medal of Merit.

Today we salute their bravery and honor their selflessness. Harlan and Charlie's story exemplifies the qualities of the Boy Scouts of America and represents the best that America has to offer.

GOVERNMENT INTRUSION INTO THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting because of the high cost of health care. I am a medical doctor. We need to fix the system. It is affecting everybody. It is health care financing that is the problem. Why are health care expenses so high?

In my rural south Georgia medical practice, I had a lab. Congress passed a bill called CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, that shut down my lab. Prior to being shut down, if a patient came to see me with a red, sore throat and running a fever, I would do a CBC, a complete blood count, to see if they had a bacterial infection and thus needed antibiotics, or a viral infection where antibiotics are not going

to help. I charged \$12 to do the test in 5 minutes. CLIA shut my lab down. I had to send patients across the way to the hospital, 2 to 3 hours at \$75.

It is government intrusion into the health care system that has caused this high cost. We have got to get the government out of it. This public option is going to force everybody from their private insurance over to a public insurance where the system is already broken, where we are having rationing of care and where a government bureaucrat is going to make health care decisions for you. The American people need to stand up and say "no" to this public option.

HARD TIMES IN THE FIRST DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, like the rest of the Nation, it has been a hard summer for the First District of South Carolina.

Just last week, Georgetown County's International Paper cut their hours, and the Mittal Steel Mill closed indefinitely, putting 275 South Carolinians out of work. With 14.7 million unemployed Americans, this number seems small; but with no end in sight, closings like this will continue nationwide.

More than 4 months after the stimulus bill's passage, we still face the highest unemployment rate in 25 years. South Carolina itself has a rate of over 12 percent, the fourth highest in the Nation.

Sadly, the Democrats' only answer is more Federal spending and a cap-and-trade national energy tax that will increase energy costs for every American, sending millions of jobs overseas.

These are not plans for prosperity, and the administration must be held accountable for them and their failed stimulus, a plan pushed through Congress with false promises of immediate relief.

The Republican plan, though ignored, would have cost half as much and created twice as many jobs, but, as every American continues to ask, "Where are the jobs," we vow to work towards real solutions for American families, small businesses and manufacturers.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT OF \$11.5 TRILLION

(Mr. WESTMORELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, as we heard a previous speaker say, the national debt right now, as of June 30, stood at \$11.5 trillion.

How much is 1 trillion? Does everybody know how much 1 trillion is, Mr. Speaker? I don't know, but I would like to explain it. One million seconds, 1 million seconds is a little over 11 days. One billion seconds is 31 years and 8

months, 31 years and 8 months for 1 billion seconds. How many years is 1 trillion seconds? One trillion seconds is 31,710 years; 31,710 years is made up by 1 trillion seconds.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to give somebody \$1,000 a second, 60 seconds a minute, 60 minutes an hour, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, 365 days, it would take me 31.7 years to spend \$1 trillion.

THE EFFECTS OF THE STIMULUS BILL

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, back in January of this year, this administration issued a report called, "The Job Impact of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act," the stimulus. This study said that "a key goal of the administration is that it should save or create 3 million jobs by the end of 2010."

When this Congress passed the stimulus and spent \$800 billion, they said, We will start adding jobs rather than losing them. As a matter of fact, Majority Leader HOYER said, There will be an immediate jolt in jobs. This will be creating jobs immediately.

Let's see, it has been 5 months since the bill passed. Here is a chart. The blue line shows what they predicted. The red line shows the loss of jobs that actually occurred. Millions of jobs have been lost despite their spending \$800 billion of the taxpayers' money. And now Vice President BIDEN has the temerity to say, Well, we misread the economy.

Well, do you know what, Mr. Speaker? Every single Republican did not misread the economy. That is why every single Republican voted against that \$800 billion stimulus, because we knew that it would spend too much, that it would borrow too much, and that it would eventually tax too much of the American taxpayer.

ENOUGH TAXING AND SPENDING

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the deficit for this year exceeded \$1 trillion, just in this year. In fact, since President Obama has taken office, more than 2 million Americans have lost their jobs. And now with that backdrop, what is this administration talking about? First of all, the President is going around saying, The stimulus bill has done its job and is working exactly as we anticipated. Did they anticipate a bill that would cost \$800 billion in money we don't have and now 2 million more Americans losing their jobs?

It is time we get this right. While the White House is talking about even another stimulus bill, the American people are saying enough is enough. Stop

the spending, the borrowing and the taxing and let's get Americans back to work. Let's actually provide that relief to small businesses and average American families that we, on the Republican side, proposed and President Obama didn't even want to look at.

It's time to bring bipartisanship and real solutions to this problem that is facing our country instead of that tired old adage of spending and spending and borrowing and now taxing with this cap-and-trade and this health care government takeover. We have got to get back on track.

AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting, and Republicans want to help. President Obama and Democrats in Congress promised that their stimulus plan would bring immediate relief. Republicans knew better.

Unfortunately for the American people, the results are rolling in: 2 million American jobs have been lost since the stimulus was signed into law. More than 400,000 jobs were lost in the month of June alone.

Just when you thought it was clear that we can't spend, borrow and tax our way to a growing economy, Democrats propose a government takeover of health care that will lead to higher taxes, more government spending and even further job losses. The American people deserve a real plan for real recovery, not yet another excuse to increase spending, raise taxes, and grow government.

The Republican economic plan brings fiscal discipline back to Washington and lets money stay in the hands of the American people.

THE RESTORATION OF AMERICA'S GLOBAL POSITION

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama came into office, there was a hole in the ideas of America and the policy of America as great as the Grand Canyon, one of our great treasures.

Unfortunately, the lack of ideas in policy, which shouldn't be a hallmark of this country, was so great that President Obama has had to do much, and this 111th Congress has tried to help him. We didn't have an energy policy, and the flora and the fauna of this Earth and this country's energy independence and this country's reliance on fossil fuels is a very scary proposition.

We are the only industrialized country in the world without a health care policy, and we have 47 million people without health care. That is unacceptable. Our position among the nations of the world was at a low ebb. President Obama has restored that.

This Congress is trying to put America where it should be as a place of great ideas and policies, and we have got an 8-year hole to fill. It has been difficult. But we are doing the best we can with the difficult situation we have been given.

I'm proud to work with President Obama and this Congress and put America and the ship of state afloat and going in the right direction.

□ 1245

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PILOT COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAMS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2009

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1037) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a five-year pilot project to test the feasibility and advisability of expanding the scope of certain qualifying work-study activities under title 38, United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as amended.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pilot College Work Study Programs for Veterans Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. FIVE-YEAR PILOT PROGRAM FOR ON-CAMPUS WORK-STUDY POSITIONS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a five-year pilot project to test the feasibility and advisability of expanding the scope of qualifying work-study activities for purposes of section 3485(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, including work-study positions available on site at educational institutions.

(b) **TYPE OF WORK-STUDY POSITIONS.**—The work-study positions referred to in subsection (a) may include positions in academic departments (including positions as tutors or research, teaching, and lab assistants) and in student services (including positions in career centers and financial aid, campus orientation, cashiers, admissions, records, and registration offices).

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out the pilot project under this section, including regulations providing for the supervision of work-study positions referred to in subsection (a) by appropriate personnel of the Department.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to carry out the pilot project under this section.

(e) **SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this section shall not be carried out with any funds provided for or under any authority of the Readjustment benefits program described by the list of Appropriated Entitlements and Mandatories for Fiscal Year 1997 contained in the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2015 of the 105th Congress, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (H. Report 105-217). No funds shall be obligated for the purpose of carrying out this section except discretionary funds appropriated specifically for the purpose of carrying out this section in appropriation Acts enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity of the Veterans' Committee, STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN of South Dakota, for introducing this bill, the Pilot College Work Study Programs for Veterans Act of 2009. It would direct the VA to conduct a 5-year pilot project to expand on existing work study activities for student veterans to participate in work study positions in academic departments and in student services.

As this committee's chairman and a former university professor, I understand the financial hurdles of paying for college and strongly support all methods to make education more affordable for our brave veterans.

This legislation provides an additional avenue for student veterans to help pay for college and places them on a par with other students in the same financial situation. Furthermore, these new work study positions would provide student veterans with much needed job skills that they can use in their professional career.

Our chairwoman, Ms. STEPHANIE HERSETH SANDLIN, will be speaking on this bill, and I urge all our colleagues to join me in reaffirming our country's commitment to our veterans by supporting this H.R. 1037.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might use.

I rise in support of H.R. 1037, as amended, introduced by the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. The Pilot College Work Study Program for Veterans Act of 2009 would expand the number and types of work study positions at colleges and universities.

The types of work study jobs that can be funded through the Montgomery GI Bill are too restrictive. Expanding the types of jobs veterans may hold at schools benefits student veterans financially, but more importantly, in my view, it places them in positions where nonveteran students and faculty will see the advantages and results of military service to the Nation. Too often

our young people see only the entitlement side of life that requires no commitment to something other than themselves.

Just as the original GI Bill opened higher education to the masses of citizen soldiers after World War II, improved the experiences of all students, including nonveterans, this bill will broaden the impact on veterans throughout the Nation's higher educational system.

I am reminded of the statement by James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, shortly after the World War II generation filled the campuses. In recanting his earlier concerns, he stated, and I quote: The mature student body that filled our colleges in 1946 and 1947 was a delight to all who were teaching undergraduates. For seriousness, perceptiveness, and studiousness and all other undergraduate virtues, the former soldiers and sailors were the best in Harvard's history.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1037, as amended, will provide our veterans on campus a unique opportunity to earn while they learn, to build their resumes and to influence campus life. Too often our young citizens see a distorted image of veterans, and this bill will help replace that image with one of men and woman who are dedicated to education and to making meaningful contributions to society.

By enlarging the types of work study jobs veterans can hold on campus, we are putting them in the forefront of student life. As teaching assistants, administrative staff, student counselors, and other high-visibility jobs, non-veteran students and faculty will see them just as Harvard President Conant did over 60 years ago.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. I would yield as much time as she may consume to our dynamic chair of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN of South Dakota.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California, for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1037, the Pilot College Work Study Programs for Veterans Act of 2009, as amended, which the Veterans' Affairs Economic Opportunity Subcommittee passed on June 4 and the full committee approved on June 10.

I was proud to introduce this important legislation, and I would like to thank the full committee chairman, Mr. FILNER, the ranking member, Mr. BUYER, for their leadership in support of this legislation, as well as the support of Congressman GRIJALVA of Arizona, who was an original cosponsor. I have been pleased to be able to work with the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas, in a bipartisan way to advance this legislation to the full committee and now to the floor. I also

want to thank Congressman TEAGUE of New Mexico for offering an amendment to this bill during the subcommittee markup that clarified the effective end date of the pilot program.

This legislation works to expand and improve the educational benefits available to our country's veterans by directing the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to conduct a 5-year pilot project that tests the feasibility and advisability of expanding the scope of work study activities available to veterans receiving educational benefits through the VA.

Currently, eligible student veterans enrolled in college degree programs, vocational programs or professional programs, are eligible to participate in the work study allowance program. However, they are limited to positions involving VA-related work, such as processing VA paperwork, performing outreach services, and assisting staff at medical facilities or the offices of the National Cemetery Administration. Thus, veterans aren't afforded opportunities similar to those offered to non-veteran students.

This pilot program would expand the qualifying work study activities allowed to include positions in academic departments, such as tutoring or assisting with research, teaching and lab work, as well as student services such as positions in career centers, financial aid, orientation, cashiers, admissions, records, and registration offices.

Given the wide variety of tasks our men and women in uniform perform while serving their country, our Nation should be capitalizing on the unique training and skill sets that veterans who are pursuing their degrees bring to their educational institutions.

This pilot program will run from 2010 to 2014 and will give the VA an adequate opportunity to determine if this expanded work study program should be further expanded.

This bill also requires the Secretary of the VA to publish regulations on the supervision of veterans participating in these expanded work study positions.

Educational benefits are one of the essential benefits that our country gives its veterans. These benefits help our veterans take that experience that they have gained while serving, and translate that knowledge into college degrees and other types of professional development. The money we, as a Nation, invest in the education of veterans, has a direct positive economic benefit for the country.

As chairwoman of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, I look forward to continuing to work in a bipartisan manner with Mr. BOOZMAN and our subcommittee members to ensure veterans are receiving the best possible educational benefits.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, it has been 20 years now, but as a work study student myself, I wouldn't want any of my contemporaries then, and certainly the young men and women who are serving in uniform today, to be

denied particular opportunities available in an academic environment to pursue their own educational aspirations or to serve their fellow students on campus in any capacity that VA education benefits are intended to provide.

So again, I want to thank Chairman FILNER for his leadership on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) 3 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I rise today in support of the veterans of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the United States Marine Corps. I'm also an original intent constitutionalist, and I believe very firmly that most Americans understand that a national defense, a strong national defense, and thus, supporting our military men and women as well as the veterans, is critically important. It's important for the veterans, the retirees, those who are on disability. It's extremely important to them.

It is also important to our current active duty troops for us to support veterans, because how are we going to get people to stay in the military to be senior NCOs, senior officers or flag officers if we do not fulfill the promises that we make to the men and women who come into the military to begin with? And thus, it is also important in the recruiting process. How are we going to recruit good men and women to come into the military, make it a career, if we don't fulfill the promises that we have made to them as they enlist or are commissioned in the military?

Mr. Speaker, we have broken promises to the veterans. We have broken many promises. In my district, I have two stellar VA hospitals, the Charlie Norwood Veterans Medical Center in Augusta, Georgia. I also have a veterans clinic just outside of Athens, Georgia, that gives stellar care to our veterans. But veterans are denied the health care, educational needs and other things that they have been promised, and it's a travesty. We have to stop denying the veterans the promises that we have made them, and it's absolutely critical for our national defense.

Mr. FILNER. I have no further speakers and am prepared to yield back.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, to thank Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN for bringing this forward. I, like her—and it has been a little bit more than 20 years—enjoyed the ability of participating with work study. I know how important it is and how important it will be to these students if we can extend this even further to our military.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. It's a good one. I appreciate Chairman FILNER and Mr. BUYER for bringing this forward and would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1037, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1037, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the operation of House Resolution 640 is stayed pending the acceptance by the House of a resignation creating a vacancy on the committee concerned.

There was no objection.

WILLIAM C. TALLENT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 402) to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF WILLIAM C. TALLENT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1300

Mr. FILNER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this naming bill comes to us from the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN). He is a great supporter of veterans and of this Nation, and I am going to leave it to him to explain what Mr. Tallent has done to deserve this honor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he might consume to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to name the Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the William C. Tallent Veterans Outpatient Clinic.

I first want to thank Chairman FILNER and Mr. BOOZMAN, the gentleman from Arkansas, for bringing this legislation to the floor today and for their assistance and for the help of the staff on both sides in regard to this bill.

In East Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no person better known for devotion to area veterans than Bill Tallent. While the story of his service in World War II reads like a Hollywood script, his lifelong dedication to fellow veterans, his humble demeanor and his career as a public servant make him the perfect candidate for the naming of the Veterans Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville.

Following his capture by the Nazis during the Battle of the Bulge, Mr. Tallent spent 6 months as a prisoner of war. At his capture, notorious Nazi General Josef Sepp Dietrich lined him and his fellow soldiers up against a wall and ordered their execution; but through the grace of God, a fellow soldier persuaded the general to spare them and, instead, ship them to a prisoner of war camp. Mr. Tallent survived long enough to engineer an escape 6 months later with one other soldier, the only one willing to risk certain execution if captured.

As he made his way across Germany, wearing tattered clothes and sleeping in graveyards at night to avoid Nazi troops, Mr. Tallent and his fellow soldier searched for the American front line. One day, while on a scavenger trip into a nearby German town and while looking for food, a Buick carrying an American general came speeding down the street. Bill Tallent jumped in front of the car and gave a salute. He was rescued. His bravery, determination and sacrifice during this experience earned him two Purple Hearts and one Bronze Star.

While Bill Tallent's prisoner of war story is legendary, so is his service to veterans. Mr. Tallent founded the Smoky Mountain chapter of American Ex-Prisoners of War, where he served as its commander. During his tenure, he helped compile the prisoner of war stories of other members, and he gave

the publication to the Knox County Public Library for posterity. He has spoken to many civic clubs and to other groups about his experiences and about his dedication to veterans and to this country.

He was also appointed by the Governor to serve on the Veterans Administration Home Policy Board, where Mr. Tallent was instrumental in bringing a veterans' nursing home to Knoxville.

Bill Tallent's lifelong service to veterans also includes serving as commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, chapter 356; as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, chapter 173; and as a member of the Disabled American Veterans, chapter 26.

In addition to his service to veterans, Mr. Tallent devoted his professional career to the public good, serving as Knox County Commissioner of Finance from 1953-1980, being reelected to that position several times.

Mr. Speaker, there is, perhaps, no greater sacrifice an American can make than that of serving his country during a time of war. Bill Tallent not only answered that call but did so with courage and humility. In 2003, he told the following to my hometown newspaper, the Knoxville News Sentinel:

"I would not go through what I went through again if you paid me \$1 million a day to do it. But I would do the same thing again, without compensation, just for the privilege of living as a free American."

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree we need more Bill Tallents in this world. I appreciate this opportunity to honor Bill Tallent, and this country is a better place today because of him and because of his service to this country. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to name the Veterans Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee as the William C. Tallent Veterans Outpatient Clinic.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we've all seen the old World War II movies where the hero barely escapes death or captivity through the valiant efforts of others or by his own wit or ingenuity. William C. Tallent was one of those true American heroes who has done both.

Serving in the United States Army as part of the 28th Infantry Division of World War II, as Mr. DUNCAN said, he was captured and, along with other American troops, was nearly executed. Mr. Tallent spent 6 months in captivity at a POW camp before escaping with another American soldier willing to face execution if recaptured by the Germans. For his bravery, determination and sacrifice during the war, Bill Tallent, who was twice wounded, was awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star.

Naming the VA Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee as the William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs

Outpatient Clinic is a fitting tribute to a great public servant, veteran and servicemember. I appreciate Mr. DUNCAN's bringing this forward, and I urge my fellow Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 402, a bill to designate the VA Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic" which would honor a valiant World War II hero and servant to his fellow veterans.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the old World War II movies where the hero barely escapes death or captivity through the valiant efforts of others, or by their own wit and ingenuity. William C. Tallent is one of those true American heroes who has done both. Serving in the United States Army as part of the 28th Infantry Division in World War II, he was captured by German troops in 1944 and, along with other American troops, was nearly executed by General Josef Sepp Dietrich. Instead, the successful pleading of his commanding officer saved his and his comrades' lives just before the execution order was given.

Bill Tallent spent six months in captivity at a POW camp before escaping with another American soldier willing to face execution if recaptured by the Germans. They made their way to the American front line, sleeping in cemeteries and scrounging for food. They were found by U.S. forces, while foraging for food. For his bravery, determination, sacrifice during the war, Bill Tallent, who was twice wounded, was awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star.

During an interview in 2003 by the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Bill Tallent said best what drives Americans to fight for their country in times of war; he stated "I would not go through what I went through again if you paid me one million dollars a day to do it. But I would do the same thing again, without compensation, just for the privilege of living as a free American."

Bill Tallent has continued his dedication to our Nation's veterans through his work in various veteran organizations. He established the Smoky Mountain Chapter of American Ex-Prisoners. In his role as commander of this organization, he worked to preserve the memory of POWs by collecting the stories of other POW members and then depositing them in the Knox County Public Library. Appointed to the Veterans Administration Home Policy Board by the Governor, Mr. Tallent played an important role in bringing a state veteran's home to Knox County.

Naming the VA Outpatient Clinic in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "William C. Tallent Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic" is a fitting tribute to a great public servant, veteran, and servicemember.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the full support of my colleagues on this legislation.

We have one additional speaker. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, and I agree with my good friend JIMMY DUNCAN from Tennessee. We need more people in this country serving this Nation.

As I spoke earlier, I think we are doing a tremendous disservice to our

veterans in this country by not fulfilling the promises that we've made to them. The way that we can get more people into the military, the way that we can get more folks, good people, who will be willing to serve our Nation, is to be able to fulfill the promises that we give them on enlistment or on a commissioning.

We are not doing that. We are not fulfilling those promises. We are not giving those people the kind of health care that they so desperately need, and we are certainly not helping their spouses, because we are not giving them the health care financing that they need either.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only in support of this bill to name this facility in Knoxville after this hero, but we have to remember the heroes in Iraq and in Afghanistan today, those heroes I see at the VA hospital in Augusta, Georgia—the Charlie Norwood VA Medical Center—those heroes I see at the Eisenhower Medical Center in Fort Gordon, Georgia, those heroes who have lost a leg or an arm, those heroes who want to go back to their units in theater to continue to fight for our freedom.

We cannot turn our backs upon those heroes, just like we cannot turn our backs upon the past heroes. I think it's a travesty the way this government has treated our veterans. We're not doing them right. It verges on criminal because we have broken our promises, and we need to fulfill those promises, and I'll do everything I can as a Member of Congress in supporting the veterans in my 10th Congressional District in Georgia. As a physician, I understand their medical needs. I'll do everything I can as the Congressman from the 10th Congressional District of Georgia to make sure that our veterans have all of the promises made to them fulfilled. This government has broken promises. It continues to break promises. It has got to stop, and I'll do everything I can to fulfill those promises.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Before yielding back, I would just like to again thank the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, for bringing forward this, really, very nice and very timely recognition of Mr. Tallent. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 402.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I thank Mr. DUNCAN for bringing us this wonderful story of Bill Tallent, and I urge my colleagues to unanimously support H.R. 402.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 402.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF JUNE 22 METRORAIL CRASH

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 612) expressing the profound sympathies of the House of Representatives for the victims of the tragic Metrorail accident on Monday, June 22, 2009, and for their families, friends, and associates.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 612

Whereas late in the afternoon on Monday, June 22, 2009, two 6-car trains on the Metrorail Red Line, Train 112 and Train 214, were on the same track headed toward the Shady Grove Station;

Whereas at 4:59 p.m., Train 112 crashed into Train 214, which was waiting for another train boarding at the Fort Totten Station;

Whereas 9 people died in this accident, including train operator Jeanice McMillan, 42, of Springfield, Virginia, who loved her job and was filled with pride when her son Jordan enrolled in college; Ana Fernandez, 40, originally from El Salvador, who lived in Hyattsville, Maryland, with her husband and 6 children and was on her way to one of her two jobs when she died in the collision; and 7 residents of the District of Columbia: Mary Doolittle, 59, of Northwest, who was the face of the American Nurses Association internationally and who was helping with global accreditation for nurses; Veronica Dubose, 29, of Northwest, who was headed to her first day of school for classes to become a certified nurse; Dennis Hawkins, 64, of Southeast, who worked as a non-instructional aide and a data entry clerk for Whittier Education Center and taught vacation Bible school at Bethesda Baptist Church; LaVonda ("Nikki") King, 23, of Northeast, a mother of 2 sons who was engaged to be married and who had just bought the hair salon LaVonda's House of Beauty; General David Wherley, 62, of Southeast, the recently retired commander of the D.C. Army and Air National Guard, a command pilot who converted the D.C. National Guard from weekend warriors to Army troops performing the duties of enlisted soldiers in fields of battle in both Iraq and Afghanistan while working tirelessly to improve conditions at home for the people of the District of Columbia, especially the children, and who decided to make the city his home; his wife, Ann Wherley, 62, who retired as a mortgage banker but did not retire as a mother, grandmother, and loving wife of General Wherley ever since they were high school sweethearts at York

Catholic High School; and Cameron Williams, 37, of Northwest, who grew up in Takoma Park and who worked a night job in maintenance as a contract laborer;

Whereas according to emergency first responders, 76 people reported injuries and 51 people were taken to hospitals for treatment as a result of this accident; and

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority voted on June 23 to establish an emergency hardship relief fund of \$250,000 from a reserve fund to provide financial help for the victims of the accident, including assistance with funeral, medical, and other expenses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives expresses its profound sympathies for the victims of the tragic Metrorail accident on Monday, June 22, 2009, and for their families, friends, and associates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 612 on July 7 with members of the National Capitol Region delegation as well as with others in the House. It is with a heavy heart that I call up for consideration House Resolution 612, which expresses the profound sympathies of the House of Representatives for the victims of the tragic Red Line Metrorail accident on June 22, 2009, and for their families and friends and associates, and also recognizes the dozens of people who were injured.

I appreciate the work and courtesy of Chairman ED TOWNS, of Ranking Member DARRELL ISSA, of Chairman STEPHEN LYNCH, and of Ranking Member JASON CHAFFETZ for their efforts in bringing forward this resolution and for seeing to it that the resolution was marked up at the earliest markup meeting of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Let us begin, Mr. Speaker, by allowing each of us to take a moment on the floor of the House today to remember the nine people who were lost as a result of this tragic accident. I ask for a moment of silence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Seven of the nine were from the District of Columbia. One was from Maryland. Another was from Virginia.

Mary "Mandy" Doolittle, of the District, served the American Nurses Association by spreading its work globally.

Veronica DuBose, of the District, was a devoted mother of two who was on her way to a nursing class.

Ana Fernandez, of Hyattsville, Maryland, was a mother of six who worked tirelessly, often holding more than one job to help provide for her family.

Dennis Hawkins, of the District, was on his way to teach vacation Bible school at Bethesda Baptist Church.

LaVonda "Nikki" King, of the District, was a young mother who looked forward to opening her own beauty salon that was already planned to occur.

Cameron Williams, of the District, was headed to his nighttime maintenance job.

Of the nine, I personally know only Major General David F. Wherley, recently retired as commander of the D.C. National Guard, and his wife, Ann. General Wherley was a fighter pilot and commander of the 113th Fighter Wing at Andrews Air Force Base who rose to head the D.C. National Guard itself.

The general was especially devoted to his troops and to the children of the city, initiating programs for both. Ann Wherley, herself a professional, was a major force in the general's life and in his work. I thank the Appropriations Committee for honoring my request to have a D.C. tuition assistance bill named for the general, who was the first to bring this concern to me for introduction, and I will soon seek a proper authorization in a pending bill.

□ 1315

Jeanice McMillan, finally, was the operator of train 112. All the available evidence showed that Ms. McMillan did everything within her power to avert the accident. Ms. McMillan worked herself up the Metro workplace ladder to realize her goal of sending her only son to college. Mr. Speaker, the loss of precious lives that resulted from the June 22 accident touched their families uniquely and tragically. However, I also ask the House to remember these families who share the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority system with several hundred thousand Federal employees and with our own House and Senate congressional staff. Today let us also share with those who lost their lives as well as with those who were injured our thoughts, prayers and our deep determination to do all that we can to assure improved safety for all. I urge adoption of House Resolution 612.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 612, expressing the profound sympathies of the House of Representatives for the victims of the tragic Metrorail accident on Monday, June 22, 2009, and for their families, friends and associates. Today we, as a body, express our profound sympathy and support for the victims of this most serious and worst accident in Metro's history.

On June 22 a train heading towards Fort Totten on the Red Line slammed

into an idling train in front of it and killed nine people and injured nearly 80 others. The crash occurred at approximately 4:59 p.m. We are greatly saddened by this unnecessary tragedy and senseless loss of life, but our grief cannot compare to the families and friends who lost loved ones that day. Today we extend our sympathies to those who were lost and injured. The nine Metro riders killed on that fateful day were from all walks of life, a reflection of our Nation's Capital and its residents.

As we express our sympathy for the victims, I would also like to commend the D.C. and regional emergency personnel who responded to the accident and did their jobs with competence and compassion. I would also like to recognize the heroism of the other train passengers who helped to free those who were trapped, fashioned tourniquets and comforted the injured. In addition to the death and injury to the victims, there's been tremendous damage done to the morale of Metro riders and to Metro's reputation. A recent Washington Post editorial commented on the crash as having "shattered many riders' assumptions about the safety of the system." Clearly there is much work to be done to ensure nothing like this terrible accident ever happens again.

But today in this House it is time we take a moment to honor and express our profound sympathy for the victims of this tragic Metrorail accident of June 22 and their families, friends and associates. I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing our sympathies on this day by passing House Resolution 612.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, Mr. HOYER of Maryland, who has led the delegation on matters pertaining to WMATA, or the Metro, and especially this accident.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairlady, my colleague and friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. I thank Mr. WESTMORELAND for helping this legislation come to the floor.

Today the House pauses in solemn remembrance of the nine men and women who lost their lives when two Metro trains collided on June 22. It was, as has been said, the deadliest crash in Metro's history. Those whose lives we lost were a cross section of our Washington region. They never asked or expected to be memorialized together, but they were brought together in tragedy. Together we can say their names:

Mary Doolittle, 59 years old, of Washington, D.C.;

Ana Fernandez, 40 years old, of Hyattsville, Maryland, my district;

Dennis Hawkins, 64 years old, of Washington, D.C.;

LaVonda "Nikki" King, 23 years old, of Washington, D.C.;

Veronica Dubose, 29 years old, also of Washington, D.C.;

Cameron Williams, 36 years old, also of Washington;

Major General David F. Wherley Jr., 62 years old, and his wife Ann Wherley, 62 years old, both of Washington, D.C.;

And lastly, Jeanice McMillan, 42 years old, of Springfield, Virginia. Ms. NORTON mentioned her activity and the professionalism with which she carried out her duties. It is clear that what happened was a computer failure or a line failure, some failure which was supposed to automatically notify the train that was moving that there was a train stopped in front of it. That mechanism failed. Today nine families are incomplete. There are nine fresh wounds that will be very slow in healing. Nothing, of course, can reverse those deaths; but we must learn from them, and we must act to prevent such tragedies in the future. On a practical level, we must ensure that funding is sufficient to accomplish that objective. On a personal level, we can choose to take from this the reminder of the fragility and uncertainty of our own lives and to act on that knowledge every day.

On June 22 we lost nine irreplaceable men and women. May we honor their memories by acting to prevent a future tragedy and by instilling confidence in the safety of America's subway.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, thank you, Ms. NORTON, for bringing this resolution to the House floor for its consideration.

Monday, June 22 tragedy struck Washington.

Around 5:00 p.m. at the start of the evening rush hour, Metro Train 112 struck Train 214 as it was waiting for a third train to finish boarding passengers at the Fort Totten Station.

Nine people lost their lives and 76 others were injured, 41 of whom were transported to nearby hospitals for treatment.

We are all saddened by the loss of life and I wish once again to express my condolences to the family and friends of those who suffered an injury or lost a loved one on that tragic Monday.

I also wish to express my appreciation to Metro and the emergency responders who were on the scene immediately with assistance.

As we gain insight on the cause of the accident, I will be working with my colleagues, many of whom are cosponsors of this resolution, to ensure this type of tragedy is never allowed to happen again.

We are in fact working to secure the funding to replace the older type "1000" rail cars that failed to hold up during the crash and any other resources Metro needs to restore full service.

The tragedy has brought us together as a region, and together we will work to make sure Metrorail remains a transportation system that is safe, efficient, affordable and secure.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my House colleagues in support of this resolution expressing sympathy to the victims of the Metrorail accident on June 22.

I want to share my heartfelt condolences to the families and friends of those that lost their lives in this tragic accident.

The Washington metropolitan area congressional delegation has pledged to work together to ensure that Metro has the funding it needs

to address safety issues and to adequately maintain the system.

Again, I express my deepest sympathies to those affected by this horrible accident.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, our legion experienced a terrible tragedy as two metro trains collided on the red line, resulting in 9 deaths and nearly 80 injured. I rise to express deep sympathy to the families of all those who lost their lives—Mandy Doolittle, Veronica DuBose, Dennis Hawkins, LaVonda “Nikki” King, Major General David Wherley and Ann Wherley, Cameron Williams, and train operator Jeanice McMillan.

I also want to especially recognize the life of my constituent, Ana Fernandez of Hyattsville. Ana will be remembered for her dedication to her family, especially her six children ages 2 to 21. She emigrated to the United States 20 years ago to secure a better life and worked tirelessly to support her parents and son back in El Salvador and her five children here in the U.S. She was able to realize her dream of sponsoring her eldest son for a visa, and he arrived only 18 days before the accident. Her family and community speak of her kindness, generosity, and indomitable spirit. I send sincere condolences to her children, her husband, her parents, and her entire family.

In the hours and days after the accident, we received reports of courage and kindness on those metro trains—from the passengers who comforted and assisted each other to the first responders who rushed to the scene and treated the injured. Almost immediately, local and federal agencies, including WMATA, the National Transportation Safety Board, the Federal Transit Administration, and the Tri-State Oversight Committee, as well as the Amalgamated Transit Union, got to work to find out what caused the crash and what must be done to ensure the safety of the system. I want to particularly commend John Catoe and the staff at WMATA for their efforts in these past few weeks.

Out of this tragedy, we must renew our commitment to America's subway and make the safety improvements necessary to ensure that such a devastating accident never happens again. I am pleased that the Transportation-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee included \$150 million for WMATA in its bill, which is the full federal share of the dedicated funding authorized by last year's Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act. I urge my colleagues to support that vital funding. This accident must be a wake-up call—we cannot afford to wait.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I will yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, again, let me urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 612.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 612.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING WAYMAN LAWRENCE TISDALE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 469) honoring the life of Wayman Lawrence Tisdale and expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on his passing.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 469

Whereas Wayman Lawrence Tisdale was born and raised in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and became an outstanding athlete as a student at Booker T. Washington High School;

Whereas in 1982 Mr. Tisdale was named Oklahoma's only McDonald's All American and was named Converse National High School Player of the Year;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale's 3-year career at the University of Oklahoma, from 1982 to 1985, has left a legacy of excellence and respect for the program and the sport of basketball;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale in 1983, 1984, and 1985 received the honor of being named Big Eight Player of the year for the University of Oklahoma;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale was named to the All-American team 3 times in 3 years while at the University of Oklahoma;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale played on the U.S. Olympic team in 1984 and received a gold medal;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale was named the Most Valuable Player for the Big Eight Tournament Championship in 1985;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale was selected as the No. 2 overall draft pick in the National Basketball Association in 1986;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale left his mark on the sport of professional basketball with the Indiana Pacers, Sacramento Kings, and Phoenix Suns, scoring more than 12,800 points and pulling down more than 5,000 rebounds in a 12-year career;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale subsequently released 8 albums of jazz music following his extraordinary basketball career;

Whereas in 1995 Mr. Tisdale's jazz album *Power Forward* reached No. 4 on Billboard's Contemporary Jazz chart, and Mr. Tisdale's album *Way Up* reached No. 1 on Billboard's Top 10;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale has been an inspiration to those in the Jazz community;

Whereas Mr. Tisdale served as a testament and example to the power of perseverance and positive thinking in the midst of personal trial; and

Whereas Mr. Tisdale's admirable character has served as a strong example to thousands of Americans to persevere and not be bound by one calling in life, but to achieve all which they hope and aspire to for themselves and their families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives expresses—

(1) gratitude to Wayman Lawrence Tisdale for his exceptional character and for the example that he served as a testament to the powers of positive thinking; and

(2) profound sorrow at the death of Mr. Tisdale and condolences to his family, friends, and colleagues, and to the State of Oklahoma that he represented so well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H. Res. 469 for consideration, honoring the exceptional life of Wayman Lawrence Tisdale and expressing sincere condolences on his passing.

H. Res. 469 was introduced by our colleague, Representative TOM COLE of Oklahoma, on May 21, 2009, and reported out of the Oversight Committee by unanimous consent on June 18, 2009. Additionally, this resolution enjoys the bipartisan support of over 50 Members of Congress.

Born in Fort Worth, Texas, on June 9, 1964, Wayman Tisdale grew up in Tulsa, Oklahoma, where he developed his dual affections for the sport of basketball and what Wayman considered his first love, music. Notably, while Wayman was considered one of the most heavily recruited high school basketball players in the Nation, he always continued to play bass guitar during morning services at his father's Tulsa church.

Wayman subsequently accepted a basketball scholarship from the University of Oklahoma where he was a three-time All-American from 1983 to 1985, including his freshman year, marking the first time that a freshman has been named as a first-team All-American since freshmen were allowed to play again in the 1971–1972 season. During his collegiate career with the University of Oklahoma Sooners, Wayman was also honored as Big Eight Conference player of the year for three consecutive seasons and still holds Oklahoma's career record with 2,661 points and career rebounding record with 1,048 rebounds. In addition, he remained devoted to music, as he continued to play bass guitar at Sunday services in Tulsa and even played in the Oklahoma Sooners band.

In honor of his remarkable achievements as a Sooner, in 1997 Wayman became the first player in any sport to have his jersey number, number 23, retired by the University of Oklahoma and in April of 2009 was inducted into the National Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame.

Prior to his selection as a second overall pick in the 1995 NBA draft by

the Indiana Pacers, Wayman honorably represented his country as a member of the 1984 U.S. Olympic basketball team which won the gold medal in Los Angeles. He then embarked on an impressive 12-season professional basketball career as a power forward and center with the Pacers, the Sacramento Kings and the Phoenix Suns.

Upon his retirement from the NBA in 1997, Wayman continued to develop his musical talent and subsequently became an award-winning contemporary jazz musician. Wayman had launched his professional music career with the 1995 release of his jazz album, *Power Forward*, which reached number four on *Billboard's Contemporary Jazz Albums* chart. He subsequently released seven additional jazz albums, all of which reached the Top Ten on *Billboard's Contemporary Jazz Albums* chart, including three albums that went to number one.

In addition to his success on the basketball court and his influence on jazz music, Wayman will be equally remembered for his exceptional character, positivity and heart. As noted by his former Indiana Pacers teammate Reggie Miller, Wayman "was the nicest man in the world with the biggest heart and an even bigger smile. I thank him for befriending me and for showing me there is more to life than just basketball."

Regrettably, Wayman Lawrence Tisdale passed away on May 15, 2009, at the young age of 44. Mr. Speaker, let us honor this exceptional athlete, musician and man through the passage of H. Res. 469. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, my friend and the author of this resolution from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill to honor a great American and a great Oklahoman, Wayman Lawrence Tisdale. I would like to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their work on the bill. As the gentlelady from the District of Columbia so aptly noted, Wayman Lawrence Tisdale was an all-star basketball player and a brilliant jazz musician. However, Tisdale was not only an exceptional athlete and musician, he brought a positive spirit to everything he did and should serve as a role model to all Americans. Even when he faced personal adversity, he maintained an optimistic attitude and brought joy to all of those surrounding him.

□ 1330

Wayman Tisdale was raised in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and the youngest of six children of a distinguished Baptist minister and a loving wife. At 6'9", Wayman excelled as a basketball player at Booker T. Washington High

School where he was named Oklahoma's only McDonald's All American and was named Converse National High School Player of the Year. Though Tisdale had many scholarship offers, he chose to remain close to home and attend the University of Oklahoma.

After arriving at the University of Oklahoma, Tisdale quickly distinguished himself as one of the greatest basketball players the school has ever seen. In his 3-year college career, he received the honor of being named Big 8 Player of the Year in 1983, 1984, and 1985. Mr. Speaker, he was also named to the All American Team three times in 3 years while at the University of Oklahoma.

Tisdale averaged 25.6 points a game and 10.1 rebounds a contest during his career with the Sooners. He still holds Oklahoma career records for points and rebounds. Tisdale also owns the school's single-game scoring mark and career marks for points per game, field goals, and free throws attempted and made. Tisdale was a member of the gold medal U.S. Olympic team of 1984 and was the number two NBA draft pick in 1986. While in the NBA, Mr. Speaker, Wayman Tisdale played with the Indiana Pacers, the Sacramento Kings, and the Phoenix Suns scoring more than 12,800 points and pulling down more than 5,000 rebounds in a 12-year professional career. On November 22, 2009, Wayman Tisdale will be formally inducted into the National College Basketball Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to a remarkable basketball career, Mr. Tisdale distinguished himself as a jazz musician. As the son of a Baptist minister, he became intrigued by the bass guitarists at his father's church and began teaching himself to play guitar and bass. He recorded and released eight albums of jazz, one of which reached No. 1 on *Billboard's Top 10*; another one reached No. 4 on *Billboard's Contemporary Jazz* chart.

In addition to his solo career, Tisdale also collaborated with some of the most popular musicians in smooth jazz, including solo artists Dave Koz, Brian Culbertson, Kirk Whalum, David Sanborn, Jonathan Butler, and Everette Harp. In 2002, Wayman received the distinction of the Bassist of the Year in the National Smooth Jazz Awards.

Though Tisdale was a remarkably talented basketball player and musician, it's perhaps his positive spirit that distinguished him above all else. Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Oklahoma, we are justly proud of Will Rogers who liked to say he never met a man he didn't like. Well, I can't testify as to whether that was true of Mr. Tisdale or not, but I'm certain that Mr. Tisdale never met a man who didn't like him.

Friends and relatives have noted that Wayman was also upbeat, had a remarkable ability to smile at everyone he met, even in the darkest circumstances. Former coaches and play-

ers have said that Tisdale was able to turn the national spotlight on the University of Oklahoma basketball program not only by his incredible talent on the court, but by his positive spirit and his sheer charisma as a player and as a person.

Our Governor, Governor Brad Henry, referred to him as "one of the most inspirational people I have ever known." Fellow Olympic team member and close friend, Sam Perkins, said that Tisdale was "a real friend who's got your back and would do just about anything for you."

In 2007, Wayman Tisdale was diagnosed with bone cancer, which ultimately resulted in the removal of part of his leg. During this ordeal, Tisdale maintained a very positive spirit, which should serve as an example for all Americans and all people who struggle with hardship and disease. When referring to his battle with cancer, he said, "You don't change because things come in your life. You get better because things come in your life." Tragically, Mr. Tisdale passed away due to complications from cancer on May 15, 2009.

Despite his personal struggles, Tisdale excelled at two separate careers. His strong spirit and the positive attitude that he brought to everything that he did should serve as an inspiration to everyone. It's only fitting that Congress should pay tribute to this outstanding American.

Again, I urge the passage of H. Res. 469.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and regional Member, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and I, of course, support the resolution in front of us.

I rise, however, today to recognize the nine individuals who perished in the June 22 Metrorail crash on the Red Line. I pray that we'll never have to experience such a tragedy again.

One of those individuals was my constituent, Jeanice McMillan of Springfield, Virginia. She was the operator of the train, and she took heroic measures to try to have manual override on an automatic system that apparently failed to detect a stationary train in front of her. Her efforts saved lives; and in the course of her heroic efforts, she, of course, sacrificed her own. Her memory is an important memory, and it needs to be honored here in the United States Congress along with the other victims of that tragedy. Hopefully, the measures we are going to try to undertake this next week will go a long way to mitigating the possibility of such a tragedy recurring in the system.

Metro is important to metropolitan Washington; it's important to the Nation's Capital. It is America's subway. We need to invest in it. And in the name and memory of my constituent, Jeanice McMillan, and the other victims of that tragedy on June 22, I

would hope we'll take such actions soon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize each of the nine individuals who perished in the June 22 Metrorail crash on the Red Line and I pray that we will never have to experience such a tragedy again.

However, I want to single out the life and service of my Northern Virginia constituent, Jeanice McMillan of Springfield, who was the operator of one of the trains involved in the crash.

In the moments before she lost her life in the line of duty, Ms. McMillan's prompt and professional actions undoubtedly saved the lives of many passengers riding in the front cars of the train.

Investigators have determined that Ms. McMillan successfully activated the manual emergency brakes in an attempt to slow down the train as it hurtled toward the Fort Totten station after the train's automatic controls failed to react to the presence of another train on the tracks ahead of it.

Unfortunately, Ms. McMillan and eight passengers died when the front car of her train telescoped in the horrific crash.

Ms. McMillan began her career at Metro in 2007, after a decade of service in the United States Postal Service. By all accounts, she was an exemplary and conscientious public employee who put the welfare of others ahead of her own in her private and professional lives.

Ms. McMillan made sacrifices at home to help fund her son Jordan's college education just as she made the ultimate sacrifice at work to save the lives of others in the moments before the two Metro trains collided on that fateful day.

As I have done privately, I express my deepest condolences to the McMillan family, particularly Vernard and Jordan, and I wish them all the best.

Since the wreck, there has been renewed interest in the relatively poor safety record of the aging 1000-series cars, like the one that telescoped so dramatically in the wreck. Today, 290 of these 1000-series cars are in Metrorail's fleet of 1,126 cars. If Congress and the President approve funding the Federal Government's \$150 million matching share of dedicated funding, there will be sufficient revenue to replace these with much safer cars that are less prone to telescoping.

The regional delegation has been working tirelessly to ensure that the Federal government matches the \$150 million that Virginia, Maryland, and Washington, D.C., have already identified to ensure that the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) can conduct the necessary maintenance to prevent disasters like this in the future.

I appreciate the leadership of Chairman JOHN OLVER from the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee for including this request in his mark up this week, and I thank my colleagues from the National Capital Region for their commitment to ensuring that WMATA has the resources it needs to provide the safest possible transit service.

I ask my colleagues to join us in honoring the lives of those lost by supporting the necessary investments to help ensure such tragedies are prevented in the future.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers so I am prepared to reserve.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of the Members to support the passage of H. Res. 469.

I rise in support of H.R. 469 honoring the life of basketball star and jazz musician Wayman Tisdale and expressing condolences to his family on his death.

Today, we honor Wayman Tisdale, for his life accomplishments and for his demonstration of positive thinking, particularly in the last couple of years of his life as he battled cancer.

Mr. Tisdale's inspirational and enthusiastic way in which he lived his life serves as an example for us all. He was a star basketball player, showing a profound gift for the sport during his time at Oklahoma University in the mid-1980s. He is considered an OU basketball legend, having been a three-time All-American during his time at the university and was OU's all-time leader in scoring and field goal percentage. Mr. Tisdale was a member of the men's basketball team in the 1984 Olympics and assisted in their gold medal win.

He went on to be the second overall pick in the 1985 NBA Draft by the Indiana Pacers, and played for a total of 12 NBA seasons for the Pacers, the Sacramento Kings, and the Phoenix Suns until his retirement from the NBA in 1997.

Though his professional basketball career came to an end at that point, Mr. Tisdale did not, in any sense, slow down. He continued to participate in basketball camps for youngsters. He also became known as a talented jazz musician, releasing his first CD in 1995, which achieved the Number four spot on Billboard's Contemporary Jazz chart and also gained a spot on the R&B charts. His subsequent albums were also successful, with many earning spots on Billboard's Top 10.

Mr. Tisdale's accomplishments in his life are a reflection of his motivational frame of mind. He was noted and admired for his positive thinking, even after he was diagnosed with bone cancer in 2007. The diagnosis led to surgeries and eventually the amputation of his right leg, but Mr. Tisdale never lost his positive outlook.

Sadly, Mr. Tisdale passed away suddenly on May 15, 2009. Though he has left this world, he will forever be remembered for the optimistic and confident manner in which he led his life and, by example, encouraged us to do the same.

In a press interview in June of 2008, he said "You go through things. You don't change because things come in your life. You get better because things come in your life."

Many people can attest that they are better for having had Mr. Tisdale as a role model and a part of their lives. I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Tisdale and expressing our condolences to his family in his passing by supporting H. Res. 469.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 469, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 469.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CELEBRATING BLACK MUSIC MONTH

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 476) celebrating the 30th anniversary of June as "Black Music Month," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 476

Whereas in 1979, the month of June was proclaimed "Black Music Month" and all people in the United States were encouraged to learn more about the important role that African-American artists have played in shaping history and culture;

Whereas America's rich heritage is influenced by the diversity of its people and the important contributions of Black culture;

Whereas America's cultural story is heavily influenced by the celebration and struggle of Black people through their musical expression;

Whereas many genres of music, such as gospel, jazz, blues, rock and roll, rhythm and blues, and soul that were an integral part of American culture, trace their roots back to the banks of the Mississippi River in cities like Memphis, St. Louis, New Orleans, and other cities like Kansas City and Chicago;

Whereas the amount of musical talent and skill that came from the Mississippi Delta and the myriad of towns in this region is undeniable;

Whereas these genres of music illustrate the complexities of the African-American experience and they give a voice to many social movements and inspiration to countless generations of people in the United States;

Whereas as early as the 1860s, the ragtime artist Scott Joplin broadened the operatic and classical worlds and Black traveling brass bands trekked to Beale Street in Memphis, "Home of the Blues and Birthplace of Rock and Roll", to perform;

Whereas gospel music and its artists like Thomas Dorsey, Lucy Campbell, Dr. Herbert Brewster, Mahalia Jackson, Aretha Franklin, Shirley Caesar, and Kirk Franklin are a special part of the American tradition that spawned future musical genres;

Whereas the mid-20th Century saw the emergence of groundbreaking jazz and blues artists such as W.C. Handy, Bessie Smith, Lena Horne, Charlie Parker, Lionel Hampton, Max Roach, Billie Holiday, Count Basie, Ella Fitzgerald, Nat King Cole, Miles Davis, Etta James, John Coltrane, Charles Mingus, Thelonious Monk, Wynton Marsalis, Louis Armstrong, Professor Longhair, James Booker, the Neville Brothers, Muddy Waters, Albert King and B.B. King;

Whereas conductor and producer Quincy Jones was heavily influenced by the improvisational nature of jazz performed in Harlem by Sarah Vaughn, Duke Ellington, and Dizzy Gillespie;

Whereas multifaceted Harry Belafonte expanded the African Diaspora's music by introducing calypso to America; Odetta,

known as the voice of the Civil Rights Movement, had a powerful musical repertoire; Sammy Davis, Jr. impressed the world as crooner and a renowned entertainer; and Ray Charles, "The Genius", consolidated gospel, country, and blues music to influence rock and roll music and help to create soul music;

Whereas legends like James Brown, Bo Diddley, and Little Richard helped the transition from blues to rock & roll music with ease, Tina Turner riveted sold out audiences domestically and abroad, and Jimi Hendrix created a new musical form;

Whereas Jackie Brentson, Howlin' Wolf, The Staple Singers, Otis Redding, Rufus and Carla Thomas, Al Green, Willie Mitchell, Johnny Taylor, Isaac Hayes, and songwriter David Porter combined to place more than 167 hit songs in the Billboard Top 10 Pop charts and a staggering 243 hits in the Top 100 R&B charts at Sun Studios, Hi Records, and Stax Records in Memphis;

Whereas Stax, dubbed "Soulsville USA", had a revolutionary sound that earned eight Grammys and an Oscar;

Whereas the Motown empire attracted creative individuals such as Smokey Robinson, The Four Tops, Holland Dozier Holland, Martha Reeves, The Temptations, The Supremes, Marvin Gaye, The Jacksons, and Stevie Wonder to Detroit;

Whereas Hitsville USA produced an astonishing amount of Top 100 hits that spanned over three decades and by the 1970s was the largest independent record company in the world;

Whereas by the 1970s and 80s, new genres of music emerged in the form of funk, rhythm and blues, hip hop, and rap in cities across the country including Los Angeles, Philadelphia, New York City, and Atlanta;

Whereas African-American music illustrates exceptional musicianship;

Whereas African-American composers, writers, singers, instrumentalists, and producers are at the top of many charts and in the Gospel Music Hall of Fame, the Blues Hall of Fame, and the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame;

Whereas African-American music embodies an original expression of the human experience by entertaining, inspiring, and stirring countless people in the United States and around the world; and

Whereas June 2009 marks the 30th anniversary of "Black Music Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives celebrates the goals and ideals of "Black Music Month".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present H. Res. 476 for consideration. This resolution expresses our support for the goals and the ideals of Black Music Month.

H. Res. 476 was introduced by my colleague, Representative STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, on May 21, 2009, and reported out of the Oversight Committee by unanimous consent on June 18, 2009. Additionally, this resolution enjoys the support of nearly 70 Members, of which I am included.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrated Black Music Month this past June, I thought of the impact African American music has had on American culture. Both socially and artistically, Black music is one of the most interesting trends in American history. African American music finds its roots in the slave culture of the rural South of the United States. Blues and gospel music comes from the plantation songs of slaves. As Blacks moved north into cities such as Memphis and St. Louis, Chicago and Detroit in the early parts of the 20th century, the music transitioned and became urbanized. Blues became jazz and combined with gospel music to form soul.

It was not until the post-World War II era that mainstream America began to feel the effects of Black music when musical geniuses such as Robert Johnson, Muddy Waters, Louis Jordan, B.B. King, Chuck Berry, Bo Diddley, Little Richard and countless others began to play on the radio.

In the 1960s, soul music and rhythm and blues crossed over Black music further into the mainstream. Black music legends such as James Brown and Berry Gordy's Detroit Motown machine and Jimi Hendrix let the world know that Black music was a force to be reckoned with.

As Black music moved into the 1970s and 1980s, it took new forms. Disco, rap, and a new form of rhythm and blues would produce modern-era musical geniuses, such as the greatest entertainer of all time who just recently passed, Michael Jackson. Other musical greats, like George Clinton; Prince; and Kurtis Blow; Earth, Wind & Fire; and a host of others also helped Black music grow to phenomenal levels.

So what is the impact of Black music? The impact of Black music most notably is it told mainstream America that it is okay to express your feelings and your emotions as you see them. Black music informed America what was going on in African American communities, and it broke barriers that allowed Black people to further integrate into American society.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all of my colleagues to support the 30th anniversary of Black Music Month.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

American music reflects the culturally diverse heritage of the United States. It is almost impossible to envision American music without recognizing the influence and contributions from African Americans. The roots of Black music can be traced to the Mississippi Delta and cities such as New

Orleans, Chicago, and Kansas City. The great State of Georgia has offered music greats such as Ray Charles, Otis Redding, Gladys Knight, and James Brown, among many others. They have illustrated the personal experiences through their music, thus inspiring millions of fans and countless generations of Americans.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution celebrating the 30th anniversary of June as Black Music Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we will yield as much time as he needs to our distinguished Member from Tennessee, Representative STEVE COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished Representative from California (Ms. WATSON) for the time.

H. Res. 476 celebrates the 30th anniversary of Black Music Month. It was first introduced by President Jimmy Carter, and President Carter recognized the influence—I guess, the Waldons kind of helped President Carter get going in Georgia, in Macon, Georgia, and of course that was James Brown, and there were a whole lot of folks there that Jimmy Carter was impressed with and the Allman Brothers, too, but he certainly was a James Brown guy in Georgia.

□ 1345

I was at an event this weekend, Mr. Speaker, in Memphis at Anthony F. Elmore's home honoring African culture, and there was a gentleman who played the drums at the beginning of the presentation. And after he finished he made a comment. He said, Without Africa, there would not be a beat. There wouldn't be a beat.

And I thought about that and I thought about this resolution and realized that he was correct. The beat's what it's about, a lot of folks believe. It's what makes music what it is or rock and roll or blues or jazz. A lot of times, I mean it's lyrics and so many things, but the beat's what it is, and that's what's unique about this contribution to music is the beat.

It came from the Mississippi River. It came from the Delta. Memphis is the home of the blues and the birthplace of rock and roll. It's my hometown, and St. Louis had the blues, too. W.C. Handy was from Memphis and a great innovator, and he spent time in both Memphis and in St. Louis. And then if you spin off a little bit to Kansas City, Charlie Parker, who was really the father of bebop and jazz, and Kansas City, where they've got a jazz museum, and he got a special kind of music going and went to New York with Dizzy Gillespie and Max Roach and some other jazz greats and brought a jazz form that I guess had its roots not only in Kansas City, but also in New Orleans with Louis Armstrong and James Booker, who was such a great keyboard performer and gave birth to folks like Professor Longhair that tickled the

ivories in a special manner that's the New Orleans style. It's really a gumbo of music that comes out of New Orleans with the Neville Brothers, the Marsalis family and Louis Armstrong, who did such a special music out of New Orleans.

It all emanated from the Delta, and it came from—whether it be gospel, as Ms. WATSON commented, or blues, it evolved and brought about a new art form.

In Memphis, we had Stax Records, where Otis Redding from Georgia came to record his music. Isaac Hayes, my good friend and who was a chief in Ghana and passed just about a year ago this month, produced Shaft, and he took a special experience to Los Angeles with the Watts Music Festival. And Isaac Hayes was performance art and just beyond music. He was a unique individual who took a certain style and a certain music. Isaac never knew how to read music but he knew how to write it and produce it, and he was a genuine American, unique musician and hero.

Isaac Hayes came out of Memphis, the Bar-Kays and so many people out of Stax Records. There was also Hi Records in Memphis where Willie Mitchell produced Al Green. And Memphis is very proud of its musical heritage, which is preserved in the Stax Soulful Music where the Stax Records were on McLemore, and at the same time there was Motown in Detroit with Stevie Wonder and Martha Reeves and the Vandellas and the Supremes and on and on and on.

Memphis and Detroit both are very proud of our musical traditions and histories, and we support those; Memphis in particular, where Elvis Presley was a transformative individual that took an African American musical heritage and combined it with some Tennessee country or rockabilly and produced rock and roll. And he, like Michael Jackson, were crossover figures that had a major influence on American society because they told youth that race wasn't an issue. The music got beyond race.

America has had a problem over its history with race, and one thing Elvis Presley did is it told a lot of young white people that it was cool to shake your leg and to like music and to show some emotion and expression. And Michael Jackson showed a lot of people that what he produced was fine in different cultures, and it wasn't necessarily one race that liked that particular music or another and was a transformative effect.

The reason we celebrate Black Music Month is because of the tremendous contributions that this country has received from musicians that are African American. And whether it's jazz, whether it's blues, whether it's gospel with Mahalia Jackson and Aretha Franklin and other people from the pulpit, or whether it's other forms where Nat King Cole or Sammy Davis or Lena Horne made such an impression or Marian Anderson, it's a particu-

larly special place and it's allowed, I think, a transcendent voice for a civil rights movement.

Harry Belafonte did calypso, a different type of music, but Harry Belafonte was strong in the civil rights movement and helping move this country forward. And I think there was a lot of African American music that helped make the civil rights movement happen and make people understand, by identifying with performers in music in ways they otherwise could not identify with African Americans because of our segregated society, about how wrong it was that segregation existed and allow an opportunity for people to see that from a more personal, visceral level, and to make this country change and become the more perfect union that it needs to become and to live up to the ideals that our Founding Fathers had about a society where all men were created equal, which really wasn't true for so many years.

I think music has had a great influence, and black music has had an influence on our country that is special, and the reason we honor Black Music Month is we remember those ideals and remember these people that were creative in our society over the years. Some young people don't know about jazz. They don't know about a Lionel Hampton and what he could do with a xylophone or some of the other great performers, and we need to know that history and revere it.

I had a dear friend named Warren Zevon who died in 2003. He was a folk singer, a rock and roller, but he knew he was going to die. And when he was close to death, he talked with a man named Jorge Calderon who cowrote with him, and they were talking about dying. And he said to him, he said, Warren, it's not bad. He said, You will get to see Miles. And here was rock and roll folk singers, and what were they talking about was Miles Davis because he transcended music and race. Miles Davis, he was something special, and there were so many performers like that.

And that's the reason why it's important that we recognize that heritage and that history, what it's meant to America, not just in entertainment but in social change, and that's why I'm proud to join the 70 cosponsors and to speak in behalf of this resolution and ask that we pass H. Res. 476, that we encourage schools and teachers to teach the arts, to teach music and to teach this heritage so that people understand how music can really move a country and a society forward.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the contributions of Michael Jackson, whose passing on June 25, 2009, coincided with the June celebration of Black Music Month. Through his innovation in the field of music, music video and dance, and subsequent global

crossover appeal, Mr. Jackson paved the way for generations of African American musicians and left an indelible mark on the music industry, created a new genre and a new popular culture.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 476, which celebrates the thirtieth anniversary of Black Music Month.

Music has long been intertwined with the Black experience, especially in the United States. Its roots stretch back to the rhythms of Africa which were first brought to the shores of America by our enslaved ancestors hundreds of years ago.

Black music also provided the soundtrack to freedom and the Civil Rights Movement. The movement's unofficial anthem, "We Shall Overcome," and other Negro spirituals were sung by civil rights marchers in churches and on the road from Selma to Montgomery.

Today, it is almost impossible to imagine a style of contemporary music that has not been influenced by Black music. Jazz, gospel, rock and roll, rap, hip hop, R&B—all of these styles have become highly influential in the United States and across the globe. African American composers, writers, singers, instrumentalists, and producers also are at the top of many music charts. They have been enshrined in the Gospel Music Hall of Fame, the Blues Hall of Fame, and the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame.

Musicians such as Elvis Presley, the Rolling Stones, and the Beatles were inspired by African American artists like Sam Cooke, Aretha Franklin, James Brown, Otis Redding, Chuck Berry, Little Richard, Smokey Robinson, and others. These talented musicians also have paved the way for African American artists today because their music is a powerful, multigenerational, and creative force.

I want to commend Representative STEVE COHEN for bringing this resolution to the House floor today. Black music in all of its genres has both served to instill pride in our culture and bring people of all races together to enjoy its powerful rhythms and harmonies. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 476 on final passage.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 476, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: This letter serves as my intent to resign from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, effective today.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 22, nays 380, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—22

Bartlett	Flake	Paul
Barton (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Blackburn	Gohmert	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Souder
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Tiahrt
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Young (AK)
Chaffetz	King (IA)	
Crenshaw	Olson	

NAYS—380

Abercrombie	Butterfield	Doggett
Ackerman	Buyer	Donnelly (IN)
Aderholt	Cao	Dreier
Adler (NJ)	Capito	Driehaus
Akin	Capps	Duncan
Alexander	Capuano	Edwards (MD)
Altmire	Cardoza	Ehlers
Andrews	Carney	Ellison
Arcuri	Carson (IN)	Ellsworth
Austria	Carter	Emerson
Baca	Cassidy	Engel
Bachmann	Castle	Eshoo
Bachus	Castor (FL)	Etheridge
Baird	Chandler	Fallin
Baldwin	Childers	Farr
Barrow	Clarke	Fattah
Bean	Cleaver	Fleming
Becerra	Clyburn	Forbes
Berkley	Coble	Fortenberry
Berman	Coffman (CO)	Foster
Berry	Cohen	Fox
Biggert	Cole	Frank (MA)
Bilbray	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Connolly (VA)	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Fudge
Blumenauer	Costa	Galleghy
Blunt	Costello	Gerlach
Boccheri	Courtney	Giffords
Boehner	Crowley	Gingrey (GA)
Bonner	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Boozman	Cummings	Goodlatte
Boren	Dahlkemper	Gordon (TN)
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Granger
Boustany	Davis (CA)	Graves
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis (KY)	Green, Al
Brady (TX)	Davis (TN)	Green, Gene
Braley (IA)	Deal (GA)	Griffith
Bright	DeFazio	Guthrie
Brown (SC)	DeGette	Gutierrez
Brown, Corrine	Delahunt	Hall (NY)
Brown-Waite,	DeLauro	Hall (TX)
Ginny	Dent	Halvorson
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hare
Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.	Harman
Burton (IN)	Dicks	Harper

Hastings (FL)	Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen
Hastings (WA)	Matsui	Roskam
Heinrich	McCarthy (CA)	Ross
Heller	McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Herger	McCauley	Royce
Hereth Sandlin	McClintock	Ruppersberger
Higgins	McCollum	Rush
Hill	McCotter	Ryan (OH)
Himes	McDermott	Ryan (WI)
Hinche	McGovern	Salazar
Hinojosa	McHenry	Sánchez, Linda
Hirono	McHugh	T.
Hodes	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Hoekstra	McKeon	Scalise
Holden	McMahon	Schakowsky
Holt	McMorris	Schauer
Honda	Rodgers	Schiff
Hoyer	McNerney	Schmidt
Hunter	Meek (FL)	Schock
Inglis	Melancon	Schwartz
Inslee	Mica	Scott (GA)
Israel	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Issa	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Jackson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Miller (NC)	Sessions
(TX)	Miller, Gary	Shade
Jenkins	Miller, George	Sherman
Johnson (GA)	Minnick	Shimkus
Johnson, E. B.	Mitchell	Shuler
Jones	Mollohan	Shuster
Jordan (OH)	Moore (KS)	Simpson
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Sires
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Skelton
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Slaughter
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Smith (NE)
Kildee	Murphy (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (TX)
Kilroy	Murphy, Tim	Smith (WA)
Kind	Murtha	Snyder
King (NY)	Myrick	Space
Kingston	Nadler (NY)	Speier
Kirk	Napolitano	Spratt
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Neal (MA)	Stark
Kissell	Neugebauer	Stupak
Klein (FL)	Nunes	Tanner
Kline (MN)	Nye	Taylor
Kosmas	Oberstar	Teague
Kratovil	Obey	Terry
Kucinich	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Lamborn	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Lance	Pascarella	Thompson (PA)
Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Thornberry
Larsen (WA)	Paulsen	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Payne	Tierney
Latham	Perlmutter	Titus
LaTourette	Perriello	Tonko
Latta	Peters	Tsongas
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Turner
Lee (NY)	Petri	Upton
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Platts	Visclosky
Linder	Poe (TX)	Walden
Lipinski	Polis (CO)	Walz
LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Wamp
Loeb	Posey	Wasserman
Loeb	Price (NC)	Schultz
Lowey	Putnam	Waters
Lucas	Quigley	Watson
Luetkemeyer	Radanovich	Watt
Lujan	Rahall	Waxman
Lummis	Rangel	Weiner
Lungren, Daniel	Rehberg	Welch
E.	Reichert	Westmoreland
Lynch	Reyes	Wexler
Maffei	Richardson	Whitfield
Maloney	Rodriguez	Wilson (OH)
Manzullo	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Wolf
Markey (CO)	Rogers (KY)	Woolsey
Markey (MA)	Rogers (MI)	Wu
Marshall	Rohrabacher	Yarmuth
Massa	Rooney	

NOT VOTING—30

Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Sarbanes
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Schrader
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Sestak
Bono Mack	Edwards (TX)	Shea-Porter
Boucher	Filner	Stearns
Calvert	Grijalva	Sullivan
Cantor	Mack	Sutton
Carnahan	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Clay	Olver	Wittman
Conyers	Rothman (NJ)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1421

Messrs. CAPUANO, MELANCON and MORAN of Virginia and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 531, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 531, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PORT CHICAGO NAVAL MAGAZINE NATIONAL MEMORIAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1044) to provide for the administration of Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial Enhancement Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, PORT CHICAGO NAVAL MAGAZINE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED; ADMINISTRATION.—Section 203 of the Port Chicago National Memorial Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-562; 16 U.S.C. 431; 106 Stat. 4235) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System in accordance with this Act and laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the National Park Service Organic Act (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.). Land transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (d) shall be administered in accordance with this subsection.

“(d) TRANSFER OF LAND.—The Secretary of Defense shall transfer a parcel of land, consisting of approximately 5 acres, depicted within the proposed boundary on the map titled ‘Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial, Proposed Boundary’, numbered 018/80.001, and dated August 2005, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior if the Secretary of Defense determines that—

“(1) the land is excess to military needs; and

“(2) all environmental remediation actions necessary to respond to environmental contamination related to the land have been completed in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

“(e) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to provide as much public access as possible to the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial without interfering with military needs. This subsection shall no longer apply if, at some point in the future, the National Memorial ceases to be an enclave within the Concord Naval Weapons Station.

“(f) AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF CONCORD AND EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into an agreement with the City of Concord, California, and the East Bay Regional Park District, to establish and operate a facility for visitor orientation and parking, administrative offices, and curatorial storage for the National Memorial.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REMEDIATION AND REPAIR OF NATIONAL MEMORIAL.—

(1) REMEDIATION.—It is the sense of Congress that, in order to facilitate the land transfer described in subsection (d) of section 203 of the Port Chicago National Memorial Act of 1992, as added by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense should remediate remaining environmental contamination related to the land.

(2) REPAIR.—It is the sense of Congress that, in order to preserve the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial for future generations, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior should work together to develop a process by which future repairs and necessary modifications to the National Memorial can be achieved in as timely and cost-effective a manner as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1044 provides that the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial be managed as a unit of the National Park System. Currently the area is managed as an affiliated site by the National Park Service.

On July 17, 1944, 320 men were killed in an explosion at the Port Chicago Navy ammunition loading base in the San Francisco Bay area. This was the largest homeland disaster during World War II.

Of the dead, 202 were African American enlisted men who were assigned to moving ammunition, a highly dangerous job for which they had not received adequate training. Fearful of another explosion, 258 of their sur-

viving fellow sailors refused to work without more training. In response, the Navy charged 50 men with mutiny, and all were convicted.

The public outrage over the unjust convictions was a key factor in the Navy's 1946 decision to end race-based assignments and President Truman's 1948 order to integrate all of the Armed Forces.

In 1992, Congress designated the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial. The pending measure furthers that commitment by providing that the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial be managed as a unit of the National Park System, a change that acknowledges the actual role the NPS is playing on the ground in maintaining and interpreting the memorial.

The sponsor of this measure, Education and Labor Committee Chairman GEORGE MILLER, has worked tirelessly with the Army and the Navy, as well as the National Park Service, to move this legislation forward. Chairman MILLER is to be commended for his hard work on this bill.

I support H.R. 1044 and urge its adoption by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1044, but I do regret that sadly so many of the men who are being memorialized by this legislation are not alive to witness this action today. Time has robbed us of many who survived the explosion. We should all be thankful that the Almighty blessed us with men like those who sacrificed in so many ways at the Port Chicago magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following exchange of letters between the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Armed Services concerning H.R. 1044.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2009.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR NICK: On February 12, 2009, H.R. 1044 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1044 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over this legislation, the Committee on Armed Services will waive further consideration of H.R. 1044. I do so with the understanding that by waiving further consideration of the bill, the Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claims over similar measures. In the event of a conference with the Senate on this bill, the Committee on Armed Services reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees.

I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter and a copy of your response in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2009.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC.

DEAR IKE: Thank you for your willingness to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1044, a bill to provide for the administration of the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System.

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 1044, even though your Committee has a jurisdictional interest in the matter and has received an additional referral. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Armed Services if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of H.R. 1044 on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the gentleman from California, the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. MILLER, to take as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman and chair of the subcommittee for yielding me this time and for bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

I rise in strong support of the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial Enhancement Act of 2009.

It is fitting that we are taking up this legislation today, as this week marks the 65th anniversary of the munitions explosion at the Port Chicago Naval Magazine facility in California, a disaster that killed more than 300 people and wounded hundreds more. Port Chicago was the site of the worst home front disaster of World War II, and it was a turning point in American history.

When sailors were ordered to resume work a few weeks, or even sooner, after the deadly explosion, white sailors were given time off to grieve and to deal with the aftermath of the explosion. Black sailors were ordered to go back to work immediately, and most of them refused to return to work to their dangerous assignments until such time as supervision, training, and working conditions could be improved and they could be told why that explosion took place.

In response, the Navy charged 50 men with conspiring to mutiny. All were convicted. The majority of the men killed at Port Chicago and all those

convicted of mutiny were African Americans.

The injustice and the legal battles that followed strongly influenced the Navy's move toward desegregation in 1945, and President Truman's 1948 executive order desegregating the Armed Forces and guaranteeing "equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion or national origin."

When this bill becomes law, the National Park Service will be able to budget for the memorial's needs, and an interpretive center authorized here will allow veterans, students, and other visitors to learn about Port Chicago even if they can't access the site all of the time, which is located currently within the Concord Naval Weapons Station.

This legislation was approved by the House last year as part of the National Defense Authorization Act earlier this year, and I want to thank the Committees on Natural Resources and Armed Services for helping to expedite its consideration again today.

In particular, I want to recognize Chairwoman MADELEINE BORDALLO for managing this legislation here today; Chairman RAHALL of the Natural Resources Committee for its timely consideration and presentation to the floor; DOC HASTINGS, ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee; Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee; ROB BISHOP, ranking member of that subcommittee; Chairman IKE SKELTON of the Armed Services Committee; JOHN MCHUGH, former member of Armed Services; and BUCK MCKEON, who now holds that position on the Armed Services Committee.

I also want to thank the staff for the two committees, including Leslie Duncan, David Watkins, and David Sienicki, and Ben Miller, my legislative director.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1044.

Again, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

□ 1430

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have no more speakers on my side, and if the gentlelady is the last speaker on that side, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1044—The Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial Enhancement Act of 2009. I would like to thank my colleague from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, for offering this resolution and for his lengthy and dedicated work to ensure that history records the real story of the bravery and heroism of those injured and killed at Port Chicago on July 17, 1944.

On that day, 320 sailors and civilians were killed when munitions caches being loaded onto ships at Port Chicago, California, accidentally detonated. In addition, 390 sailors and civilians were injured in the explosion. The

vast majority of the dead and injured were enlisted African Americans serving our country during World War II.

Following the accident, when servicemen protested the dangerous process of loading munitions and the apparent lack of interest or will to remedy the process, the men were court-martialed for being "mutinous" and sentenced to prison terms. The group came to be known as "The Port Chicago 50."

This accident happened during a time when segregation in all aspects of American life still raged in our country. Even men who put their lives on the line for our country were not spared from the effects of racism. Not surprisingly, both the ensuing reparations for family members and the shameful trial of these men were loaded with racial overtones.

The least we can do then is to upgrade the status of the Memorial erected in honor of those killed at Port Chicago to that of a National Park, so that we can direct appropriate Federal funds to repair and maintain the Memorial.

In addition, I hope we can take the additional step of exonerating these men and expunging their criminal records. In the meantime, let's honor the fallen of Port Chicago by supporting H.R. 1044.

I again thank my colleague, Mr. MILLER, for offering this bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1044, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS SUBMERGED LAND CONVEYANCE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 934) to convey certain submerged lands to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in order to give that territory the same benefits in its submerged lands as Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa have in their submerged lands, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705) is amended by inserting "the Commonwealth of the North-

ern Mariana Islands," after "Guam," each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705) to the "date of enactment" shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I call up for the consideration of the House H.R. 934, which is the first bill introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Mr. KILILI SABLAN. I thank the gentleman for bringing the subject matter of this bill to our attention.

This measure provides equity to the CNMI. It is the only U.S. territory that does not control its submerged lands. The bill before us would simply convey the submerged lands surrounding the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands extending out to 3 nautical miles to the Government of the CNMI. This is the same treatment of submerged lands afforded to Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

I would like to thank Mr. SABLAN for introducing this legislation and for making H.R. 934 one of his first legislative priorities as the delegate from the CNMI.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 934, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, under this legislation, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands will have parity with other U.S. territories by gaining jurisdiction over its submerged lands out to 3 geographic miles. The other territories were given jurisdiction over submerged lands out to 3 geographic miles in the 1974 Submerged Lands Act. It is time that the Commonwealth is given the same authority, and this legislation provides that.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the author of the bill and the gentleman from the CNMI, Mr. SABLAN, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Guam,

the distinguished chairwoman of our subcommittee, MADELEINE BORDALLO, for her leadership on many matters pertaining to the insular areas and to the Mariana Archipelago islands that we represent here in Congress. I want to especially thank her for her support of H.R. 934.

On February 25, 2005, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands awoke to the news that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had affirmed a lower court ruling stating that the submerged lands and the waters above them surrounding our islands do not belong to us; rather, they are the property of the United States of America. The decision came as a shock.

For at least 3,500 years, the Chamorro and Refaluwasch people have lived on these islands and fished and sailed in the waters around them. Never did we think them not our own, nor did the people of the Northern Mariana Islands ever believe, in entering the Covenant of Political Union with the United States of America, that we were relinquishing our rights and title to the submerged lands and waters surrounding us. These lands and waters have always been an integral part of our existence, essential to our being and livelihood and to the sense of who we are; yet the Ninth Circuit ruled otherwise.

In doing so, the Court did, however, "recognize the importance of the submerged lands to the culture, history and future of the Northern Mariana Islands," and acknowledged that Congress, if it chose, could remedy the situation and return these lands to the people of the Northern Mariana Islands, and that is what H.R. 934 does.

The bill conveys to the people of the Northern Mariana Islands the submerged lands surrounding our islands and extending 3 geographic miles outward from their coastlines. The measure is supported by the elected leadership of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

I ask to enter into the RECORD this letter jointly signed by Governor Benigno R. Fitial, Speaker of the House Arnold I. Palacios, and Senate President Pete P. Reyes, in which the three confirmed their support of H.R. 934.

I would also like to add to the RECORD a second letter of support. This is from the Friends of the Monument, an organization that worked for and successfully achieved the designation of large areas of the waters and lands in the Marianas as the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument.

The Monument is one of the largest marine conservation areas in the world, which we share with our neighbor, Guam, 115,000 square miles, and protects the world's deepest ocean, the Marianas Trench, 35,813 feet deep.

It is the understanding of all parties that H.R. 934 gives the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands the same ownership rights over the submerged land surrounding our islands as

are possessed by Guam, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa.

This conveyance includes the three northernmost islands in the Northern Mariana Islands, which constitute the "Island Unit" in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument by Presidential proclamation on January 6, 2009.

It is also understood that after this bill is enacted into law, the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands will have the option of exercising full control over the submerged lands surrounding these three islands, or deciding to include those submerged lands within the Monument under comanagement with responsible Federal agencies.

The proclamation committed the Federal Government to providing the Commonwealth with this option, and H.R. 934 expressly provides that it does not amend, repeal or otherwise alter the proclamation and the commitments attached to it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 934 is the very first bill that a representative of the people of the Northern Mariana Islands has ever introduced in the United States Congress.

I ask my colleagues to support the measure. I thank the ranking member, Mr. HASTINGS, also for his support of the measure, and I express my hope that this bill giving back to the people of the Northern Mariana Islands what they always believed to be their own will be the first bill introduced by their own representative that is enacted into law.

COMMONWEALTH OF THE
NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
Saipan, MP, July 9, 2009.

Hon. GREGORIO C. SABLÁN,
*CNMI Delegate to the United States,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLÁN: We are jointly writing to inform you that we are completely united in our support for HR 934. We urge you to push for the passage of this legislation in order to give the CNMI control over the first three miles of its submerged lands.

We support this legislation with a certain understanding of the provisions of H.R. 934 that we urge you to include in the Congressional record, namely, that H.R. 934 would provide for the following: H.R. 934 will give the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands the same ownership rights over the submerged lands surrounding its islands as are possessed by Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. This would include the submerged lands around the three northernmost islands in the Commonwealth, which constitute the "Islands Unit" in the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation on January 6, 2009. After this bill is enacted into law, the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands will have the option of exercising full control over the submerged lands surrounding these three islands or deciding to include those submerged lands within the Monument under co-management with the responsible federal agencies. The Proclamation committed the federal government to providing the Commonwealth with this option and H.R. 934 expressly provides that it does not amend, repeal, or otherwise alter the Proclamation.

With this understanding of the contents of H.R. 934, we urge you to support H.R. 934 for the benefit of the people of the CNMI.

Sincerely,

BENIGNO R. FITIAL,
Governor.

PETE P. REYES,
Senate President.

ARNOLD I. PALACIOS,
Speaker of the House.

FRIENDS OF THE MONUMENT,
Saipan, MP, June 23, 2009.

Re Marianas Trench Marine National Monument.

Representative GREG CAMACHO SABLÁN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

H.A.F.A. ADAI DELEGATE SABLÁN, This letter is a follow-up to the letter we sent you dated April 17, 2009. In that letter we requested for "the state waters from 0-3 miles surrounding the islands of Uracas, Maug, and Asuncion (to) remain a part of the monument, under the jurisdiction (and ownership) of the Commonwealth and co-managed with the rest of the monument by the Commonwealth and the Departments of Commerce and Interior."

This was our stance before the declaration of the monument and it is our stance today.

Many promises made by the former Council on Environmental Quality Chairman James Connaughton in the lead up to creation of the monument have been kept. The Commonwealth has received untold amounts of positive media exposure. There is a renewed world-wide interest in exploring the depths of the deepest, darkest place on Earth, as evidenced by the recent expedition by Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute to the bottom of Challenger Deep, only the third such expedition in the history of mankind. The Northern Marianas are also now recognized as the home to one of the most iconic, recognizable geological features on the planet, adding to the richness of our culture and heritage. The creation of the monument will have everlasting positive effects on our economy and the health of our marine environment and will help preserve our unique culture. It has also brought the Commonwealth closer to achieving the goals of the Micronesia Challenge, which seeks to effectively conserve 30% of the near shore resources of all the islands in Micronesia. Most importantly, in the span of just a few months our people have become worldwide leaders in ocean conservation. Perhaps you saw the Friends of the Monument on NBC Nightly News during Earth Week?

Sadly, several promises remain unfulfilled. During his visit to the Commonwealth in October 2008, Chairman Connaughton promised the people of the Commonwealth that the designation of the monument would give our people (1) co-management of the monument, (2) a visitors center on Saipan, and (3) control of the submerged lands from 0-3 miles around the 14 islands of the Commonwealth.

We remain committed to fulfilling these promises, starting with the control of the submerged lands around all the islands of the Commonwealth. Just so that we are clear, it is our recommendation that "the state waters from 0-3 miles surrounding the islands of Uracas, Maug, and Asuncion remain a part of the monument, under the jurisdiction (and ownership) of the Commonwealth and co-managed with the rest of the monument by the Commonwealth and the Departments of Commerce and Interior."

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns. Your staff has been very gracious in allowing us time to share our recommendations and concerns for the Marianas Trench Marine National Monument.

And on a final note, on behalf of the entire Friends of the Monument organization,

thank you for the recent Congressional Commendation. It is quite an honor to be one of the first organizations in the Northern Mariana Islands to be so recognized by the United States Congress.

Thank you and I look forward to your reply,

IGNACIO V. CABRERA,
Chairman, Friends of the Monument.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to welcome the gentleman from the Northern Marianas to this Chamber, and it's great to have him here. This is something that we have wanted for a long time, to have this territory represented here in the U.S. Congress.

This is a good bill. It's a bill that some of us have worked on for years to ensure that the submerged lands are where they belong, that the ownership is there, and that the rights that accrue to that attain to the Northern Marianas.

So I just stand in support of this legislation. Again, welcome, the gentleman from the Northern Marianas. We're glad he's here in Congress where he belongs.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have one additional speaker. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS, for yielding some time on this issue, and I greatly appreciate the people of the Mariana Islands wanting to control their own property. And I congratulate them on the introduction of this legislation, and I certainly support it. And I think it's very laudable that we are bringing this forward, and I very much support it.

I think States and territories should control their own property. We have too much Federal control of State property and Federal property, and I am glad to see this legislation. And I congratulate you and my friends on the other side for bringing this forward.

I am also concerned about the submersion though of the American taxpayer in just a sea of debt. We have created more debt in this Congress, this administration has proposed more debt over the next 5 years than has been created by every single Presidency since George Washington all the way through George W. Bush. And the American people are drowning in a sea of debt, and we are creating more and more debt for those people. We are robbing our children and our grandchildren of their future. The American people are going to live at a lower standard than we live today because of the debt that we are creating, and I am very concerned about that.

We have got to stop the spending. It's egregious. It's absolutely outrageous the amount of money that's being spent by this Congress. And we see bill after bill, a nonstimulus bill, an omni-

bus bill, a Wall Street bailout that our previous administration brought to us and that this Congress and this administration continued and spent the other half.

We have a health care bill that's being introduced just today that is going to create more debt, and it's going to destroy the health care system and put a Washington bureaucrat between patients and their doctor. And Washington bureaucrats are going to be making health care decisions for their patients. And the American people need to stand up and say "no." It's going to overwhelm them, a tremendous sea of debt that's being created by this Congress, and it has to stop.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just hope that the American people will understand what's going on here and will rise up, call their Congressman, call their two U.S. Senators and say "no" to this health care bill that's being introduced today. "No" to the tax and cap, so-called cap-and-trade bill that's nothing but a revenue bill that's not about the environment. Say "no" to that. "No" to this continued tsunami of spending that's going on here.

We've got a spending addiction here in Congress. I'm an addictionologist. I've practiced addiction medicine in my family practice. In addiction medicine, we say where there is not denial there is not an addiction. Congress has an addiction, a spending addiction, and they are denying it. We are denying it, and the spending has to stop.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is the last speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 934, recognizing the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands' (CNMIs') ownership of submerged lands lying three geographical miles outside of mainland coastlines.

First and foremost, I want to commend my good friend, Congressman SABLAN of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, for taking the initiative to introduce this important legislation. This bill is an example of the continued efforts by the Congress to support the Territories.

H.R. 934 seeks to officially award the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands submerged lands that are located three geographical miles outside of mainland coastlines. Submerged lands qualify as lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to, but not above, the line of high tide. American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were granted ownership over our own respective submerged lands by the 93rd session of the Congress, before the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands became a territory of the United States. The CNMI wishes to be afforded the same opportunities granted to the other territories by having these submerged lands officially recognized as a part of their Territory.

Mr. Speaker, by allowing these submerged lands to be recognized, they will fall under the

jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as opposed to that of the U.S. Seeing as the submerged lands are located so closely to the mainland, having them fall within the jurisdiction of the CNMI will allow for sufficient justice to be served. Commonwealth citizens and officials, instead of officials residing thousands of miles away, will be implementing and enforcing laws that apply to their population.

The U.S. government will still have claim over gas, oil, and other mineral deposits that may be possibly found on these lands. It should be noted that H.R. 934 applies solely to those lands that are submerged; the U.S. government will still have full control and possession of lands above sea level that do not belong to the Commonwealth. Additionally, it does not circumvent any actions that may be taken or regulations that have been put forth by U.S. naval authorities regarding these submerged lands.

It is apparent that H.R. 934 serves to benefit the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and will not be detrimental to the United States. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 934. Again, I thank my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 934, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

VALIDATING NEVADA LANDS TRANSFER

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 762) to validate final patent number 27-2005-0081, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 762

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINAL PATENT AND LAND RECONFIGURATION IN CLARK COUNTY AND LINCOLN COUNTY, NEVADA.

Patent No. 27-2005-0081 and its associated land reconfiguration issued by the Bureau of Land Management on February 18, 2005, is hereby affirmed and validated as having been issued pursuant to and in compliance with the provisions of the Nevada-Florida Land Exchange Authorization Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-275), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 for the benefit of the desert tortoise and other species and their habitat to increase the likelihood of

their recovery. The process utilized by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management in reconfiguring the lands as shown on Exhibit 1-4 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Planned Development Project MSHCP, Lincoln County, NV (FWS-R8-ES-2008-N0136) and the reconfiguration provided for in Special Condition 10 of Army Corps of Engineers Permit No. 200125042 are hereby ratified.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

□ 1445

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 762, introduced by Congressman DEAN HELLER, would validate the final patent to lands in Clark and Lincoln Counties in Nevada. Congresswoman SHELLEY BERKLEY has also worked to advance this bill.

In 2005, the Bureau of Land Management issued a final patent to reconfigure certain leased and patented lands slated for development. This adjustment was intended to provide habitat for the conservation of the endangered desert tortoise.

However, several groups objected to the process that the BLM used to adjust these lands, claiming that it failed to comply with Federal law and that it failed to provide appropriate habitat for the tortoise. The group sued the BLM and the property owners.

In 2007, the parties agreed to settle the lawsuit. H.R. 762 will implement one of several settlement stipulations by validating the final patent to the reconfigured land. All parties to the litigation support this legislation.

In addition to Congressman HELLER, I would like to highly commend Congresswoman SHELLEY BERKLEY for her leadership and tireless efforts in getting this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, we support H.R. 762, and urge its adoption by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 762. H.R. 762 will validate an existing patent for land in addition to the associated land configurations located in Clark and Lincoln Counties in Nevada. This action best enables the recovery of the threatened desert tortoise and other species and their habitats.

I, too, would like to congratulate Mr. HELLER of Nevada for bringing this issue to our attention and for moving quickly to resolve this on behalf of his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today alarmed at the spending that is going on in Washington, D.C. More specifically, I want to talk about the President's ignoring article II, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution that says, when you appoint somebody in a significant role who is part of your administration, you need to have the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Irrespective of this, President Obama has named 33 czars outside of the traditional infrastructure of Washington.

Now, in its day, czarist Russia had 18 czars over a 300-year period of time, but here, in a 7-month period of time, President Obama now has 33 czars. I guess his vision is a czarist America. I'm not sure. We have a Great Lakes czar, a regulatory czar, an automobile czar, a Guantanamo closure czar, a TARP czar, a new TARP czar, all kinds of different czars, none of whom have gone in front of the U.S. Senate.

Now, why is going in front of the U.S. Senate important aside from the constitutional requirement?

Well, for one thing, you get an automobile czar who has got some shady business dealings—a 31-year-old who doesn't know a spark plug from a lug nut. Why do you think this person could turn around Detroit? Well, we found out now he's on his way out the door ignominiously. Maybe that embarrassment to the administration could have been prevented had this 31-year-old boy genius auto czar had to sit in front of the Senate as do judicial appointees and cabinet appointees.

I think a lot of people think, well, yeah, the Senate approves Cabinet members, but they also approve deputy under secretaries. Hundreds and even thousands of people have to come before the U.S. Senate for the constitutional requirement. The Constitution can be inconvenient to this administration—I realize that—but again, article II, section 2 says you must seek the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate.

How about the energy czar? The energy czar is a member of some wacko socialist group who believes the way to deal with global warming is for large industrial countries—i.e., the United States of America, and this would be non-czarist America—to shrink their economies in order to offset their emissions. That's the belief of the group that the energy czar belongs to.

Wouldn't it be interesting to talk to the energy czar and ask her why she thinks this is a good group to be a member of? What would the socialist group have to offer to the United States of America at this point?

Perhaps the Senate would like to talk to the stimulus accountability czar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

The word "accountability" attracts my attention because the stimulus accountability czar spent \$18 million designing a Web page. A show of hands of how many of you want some of that action. Eighteen million dollars to design a Web page? Talk about stimulating the economy. Boy, that was one way to spend our money. Again, the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, article II, section 2, may have avoided that type of expenditure.

What do these people get paid, Mr. Speaker? \$172,000 a year. Thirty-three people times \$172,000—not to mention the myriad of staffs and entourages that we important people in Washington, D.C., have to go everywhere with. You never see somebody just walking in by him or herself. You always see the entourage that tells the whole world "I am important." Therefore, I get back to the constitutional question:

If you are important, and if you have to have this big staff that costs the taxpayers millions of dollars, why not comply with the U.S. Constitution's article II, section 2: advice and consent of the U.S. Senate?

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no more time or people asking for time. If the gentlewoman is the last speaker on that side, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge all Members to support this very good bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 762.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR SALE OF FEDERAL INTEREST IN SALT LAKE CITY LAND

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1442) to provide for the sale of the Federal Government's reversionary interest in approximately 60 acres of land in Salt Lake City, Utah, originally conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association under the Act of January 23, 1909, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1442

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL REVERSIONARY INTEREST, MT. OLIVET CEMETERY, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

(a) **CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.**—If, within one year after the completion of the appraisal required by subsection (c), the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah (in this section referred to as the "Association"), submits to the Secretary of the Interior an offer to acquire the Federal reversionary interest in all of the approximately 60 acres of land in Salt Lake City, Utah, conveyed to the Association under the Act of January 23, 1909 (chapter 37, 35 Stat. 589), the Secretary shall convey to the Association such reversionary interest in the lands covered by the offer. The Secretary shall complete the conveyance not later than 30 days after the date of the offer.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the lands described in subsection (a) to determine the precise boundaries and acreage of the lands subject to the Federal reversionary interest.

(c) **APPRAISAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the Federal reversionary interest in the lands identified by the survey in subsection (b). The appraisal shall be completed in accordance with the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions" and the "Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice".

(d) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest under subsection (a), the Association shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal interest, as determined under subsection (c). The consideration shall be paid not later than 30 days after the date the conveyance is made.

(e) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), all costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a), including the cost of the survey required by subsection (b) and the appraisal required by subsection (c), shall be paid by the Association.

(f) **DEPOSIT AND USE OF PROCEEDS.**—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds from the conveyance under subsection (a) in the Federal Land Disposal Account established by section 206 of the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (43 U.S.C. 2305). The proceeds so deposited shall be available to the Secretary for expenditure in accordance with subsection (c) of such section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House for its consideration this legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Utah, Representative JIM MATHE-SON.

In 1909, Congress authorized the transfer of 60 acres of Federal land in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association for use as a public cemetery. The legislation contained a reversionary clause to the Federal Government if the land were not used for the purpose of a cemetery.

Today, in order to raise revenue to operate the cemetery, the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association hopes to sell 13 undeveloped acres of this parcel to an adjacent school, and it has requested that the Federal Government relinquish its reversionary interest.

This noncontroversial bill, which was favorably reported out of the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent, authorizes the conveyance of the reversionary interest to the association in exchange for appropriate consideration based upon a survey and appraisal of the property.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman MATHESON has worked diligently on behalf of this legislation. The administration supports the bill, and I ask my colleagues to support its passage as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, a parcel of Federal land in Salt Lake City was conveyed to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association. H.R. 1442 directs the Secretary to accept an offer from the association to purchase certain reversionary interests in 60 of those acres. The bill requires the sale to be accomplished at no cost to the taxpayer and for the appraised value of the rights.

I support the bill because it reduces, although only by 60 acres, excessive Federal land holdings at a time when the Department of Interior is facing a multibillion-dollar maintenance backlog for the lands it already owns.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) such time as he may consume.

Mr. MATHESON. Well, first, I thank my colleague from Guam for recognizing me.

I am pleased to rise in support of this bill. You have heard the description of the bill, and if I could, I will just briefly point out what the repercussions are if we don't move this legislation.

This cemetery is a nonprofit entity. It has been around for about 100 years.

It is suffering some financial distress in terms of its endowment. It has figured and has looked at choices for how it could maintain itself and create greater financial viability. The notion of selling off a piece of the land that's undeveloped will ensure the integrity of the cemetery for the future. If, in fact, this cemetery were to go bankrupt and if this nonprofit couldn't continue to maintain it, the land would revert back to the Federal Government. I do not think the Bureau of Land Management wants to be in the business of owning and operating a cemetery in Salt Lake City, Utah.

So here we have a situation that is based on legislation that occurred 100 years ago, and today, we're making a substantive solution to a problem that has developed since, and there is no harm to the taxpayer. This is a commonsense bill, but I've got to tell you something: while it sounds simple, it wasn't simple, and I really want to commend the Resources Committee staff for being so helpful in working through this issue to find the right way to get it done. It may have passed the committee by unanimous consent, but that does not mean it did not take a lot of work and effort to make the right decision. So I want to thank the committee staff so much. I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Subcommittee Chairman GRIJALVA.

I encourage the passage of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and would inquire of the minority whether they have any additional speakers.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1442, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1500

JOINT VENTURES FOR BIRD HABITAT CONSERVATION ACT OF 2009

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2188) to authorize the Secretary

of the Interior, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to conduct a Joint Venture Program to protect, restore, enhance, and manage migratory bird populations, their habitats, and the ecosystems they rely on, through voluntary actions on public and private lands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLES.

This Act may be cited as the “Joint Ventures for Bird Habitat Conservation Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) migratory birds are of great ecological and economic value to the Nation, contributing to biological diversity, advancing the well-being of human communities through pollination, seed dispersal, and other ecosystem services, and bringing tremendous enjoyment to the tens of millions of Americans who study, watch, feed, or hunt these birds;

(2) sustainable populations of migratory birds depend on the conservation, protection, restoration, and enhancement of terrestrial, wetland, marine, and other aquatic habitats throughout their ranges in the United States, as well as the rest of North America, the Caribbean, and Central and South America;

(3) birds are good indicators of environmental health and provide early warning of the impacts of environmental change, helping to yield the most out of every dollar invested in conservation;

(4) human and environmental stressors are causing the decline of populations of many migratory bird species, many of them once common, and climate change will exacerbate the impacts of these stressors on migratory bird populations;

(5) the coordination of Federal, State, tribal, and local government natural resource conservation efforts and the formation of partnerships that include a diversity of nongovernmental conservation organizations, private landowners, and other relevant stakeholders is necessary to accomplish the conservation of migratory bird populations, their habitats, and the ecosystem functions they rely on;

(6) hunters, through their purchase of Federal migratory bird hunting stamps and State hunting licenses, have long supported the conservation of migratory birds and their habitats in the United States through the various State and Federal programs that are supported by the fees charged for such purchases;

(7) the Department of the Interior, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized under a number of broad statutes to undertake many activities with partners to conserve natural resources, including migratory birds and their habitat;

(8) through these authorities, the Service has created and supported a number of joint ventures with diverse partners to help protect, manage, enhance, and restore migratory bird habitat throughout much of the United States and to conserve migratory bird species;

(9) the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, adopted by the United States and Canada in 1986, with Mexico joining as a signatory in 1994, was the first truly landscape-level approach to conserving migratory game birds and the wetland habitats on which they depend, and became the foundation for the voluntary formation of Joint Ventures;

(10) since the adoption of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, joint ventures have expanded their application to all native

birds and other wildlife species that depend on wetlands and associated upland habitats, resulting in significant conservation benefits over the last twenty years;

(11) States possess broad trustee and management authority over fish and wildlife resources within their borders, and have utilized their authorities to undertake conservation programs to conserve resident and migratory birds and their habitats;

(12) consistent with applicable Federal and State laws, the Federal Government and the States each have management responsibilities affecting fish and wildlife resources, and should work cooperatively in fulfilling these responsibilities;

(13) other domestic and international conservation projects authorized under the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.) and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.), and additional bird conservation projects authorized under other Federal authorities, can expand and increase the effectiveness of the joint ventures in protecting and enhancing migratory bird habitats throughout the different ranges of species native to the United States; and

(14) the voluntary partnerships fostered by these joint ventures have served as innovative models for cooperative and effective landscape conservation, with far-reaching benefits to other fish and wildlife populations, and similar joint ventures should be authorized specifically to reinforce the importance and multiple benefits of these models to encourage adaptive resource management and the implementation of flexible conservation strategies in the 21st century.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to establish a program administered by the Director, in coordination with other Federal agencies with management authority over fish and wildlife resources and the States, to develop, implement, and support innovative, voluntary, cooperative, and effective conservation strategies and conservation actions to—

(1) promote, primarily, sustainable populations of migratory birds, and, secondarily, the fish and wildlife species associated with their habitats;

(2) encourage stakeholder and government partnerships consistent with the goals of protecting, improving, and restoring habitat;

(3) establish, implement, and improve science-based migratory bird conservation plans and promote and facilitate broader landscape-level conservation of fish and wildlife habitat; and

(4) coordinate related conservation activities of the Service and other Federal agencies to maximize the efficient and effective use of funds appropriated or otherwise made available to support projects and activities to enhance bird populations and other populations of fish and wildlife and their habitats.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONSERVATION ACTION.**—The term “conservation action” means activities that—

(A) support the protection, restoration, adaptive management, conservation, or enhancement of migratory bird populations, their terrestrial, wetland, marine, or other habitats, and other wildlife species supported by those habitats, including—

(i) biological and geospatial planning;

(ii) landscape and conservation design;

(iii) habitat protection, enhancement, and restoration;

(iv) monitoring and tracking;

(v) applied research; and

(vi) public outreach and education;

(B) are conducted on lands or waters that—

(i) are administered for the long-term conservation of such lands or waters and the migratory birds thereon, including the marine environment; or

(ii) are not primarily held or managed for conservation but provide habitat value for migratory birds; and

(C) incorporate adaptive management and science-based monitoring, where applicable, to improve outcomes and ensure efficient and effective use of Federal funds.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(3) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—The term “Implementation Plan” means an Implementation Plan approved by the Director under section 5.

(4) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(5) **JOINT VENTURE.**—The term “Joint Venture” means a self-directed, voluntary partnership, established and conducted in accordance with section 5.

(6) **MANAGEMENT BOARD.**—The term “Management Board” means a Joint Venture Management Board established in accordance with section 5.

(7) **MIGRATORY BIRDS.**—The term “migratory birds” means those species included in the list of migratory birds that appears in section 10.13 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, under the authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

(8) **PROGRAM.**—The term “Program” means the Joint Ventures Program conducted in accordance with this Act.

(9) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(10) **SERVICE.**—The term “Service” means the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(11) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and

(B) one or more agencies of a State government responsible under State law for managing fish or wildlife resources.

SEC. 4. JOINT VENTURES PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a Joint Ventures Program administered by the Director. The Director, through the Program, shall develop an administrative framework for the approval and establishment and implementation of Joint Ventures, that—

(1) provides financial and technical assistance to support regional migratory bird conservation partnerships;

(2) develops and implements plans to protect and enhance migratory bird populations throughout their range, that are focused on regional landscapes and habitats that support those populations;

(3) complements and supports activities by the Secretary and the Director to fulfill obligations under—

(A) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 701 et seq.);

(B) the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715 et seq.);

(C) the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.);

(D) the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.);

(E) the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.); and

(F) the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Act (16 U.S.C. 3771 et seq.); and

(4) support the goals and objectives of—

(A) the North American Waterfowl Management Plan;

(B) the United States Shorebird Conservation Plan;

(C) the North American Waterbird Conservation Plan;

(D) the Partners in Flight North American Landbird Conservation Plan; and

(E) other treaties, conventions, agreements, or strategies entered into by the United States and implemented by the Secretary that promote the conservation of migratory bird populations and their habitats.

(b) **GUIDELINES.**—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary, through the Director, shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines for the implementation of this Act, including regarding requirements for approval of proposed Joint Ventures and administration, oversight, coordination among, and evaluation of approved Joint Ventures.

(c) **COORDINATION WITH STATES.**—In the administration of the program authorized under this section, the Director shall coordinate and cooperate with the States to fulfill the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 5. JOINT VENTURE ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, through the Program, may enter into an agreement with eligible partners described in paragraph (2) to establish a Joint Venture to fulfill one or more of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 2(b).

(2) **ELIGIBLE PARTNERS.**—The eligible partners referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) Federal and State agencies with jurisdiction over migratory bird resources, their habitats, or that implement program activities that affect migratory bird habitats or the ecosystems they rely on.

(B) Affected regional, local, and tribal governments, private landowners, land managers, and other private stakeholders.

(C) Nongovernmental organizations with expertise in bird conservation or fish and wildlife conservation or natural resource and landscape management generally.

(D) Other relevant stakeholders.

(b) **MANAGEMENT BOARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An agreement under this section for a Joint Venture shall establish a Management Board in accordance with this subsection.

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Management Board shall include a diversity of members representing stakeholder interests from the appropriate geographic region, including, as appropriate, representatives from the Service and other Federal agencies that have management authority over fish and wildlife resources on public lands or in the marine environment, or that implement programs that affect migratory bird habitats, and representatives from the States, and may include—

(A) regional governments and Indian tribes;

(B) academia or the scientific community;

(C) nongovernmental landowners or land managers;

(D) nonprofit conservation or other relevant organizations with expertise in migratory bird conservation, or in fish and wildlife conservation generally; and

(E) private organizations with a dedicated interest in conserving migratory birds and their habitats.

(3) **FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(A) **ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS PLAN.**—A Management Board, in accordance with the guidelines published by the Director under section 4 and in coordination with the Director, shall develop, publish, and comply with a plan that specifies the organizational structure of the Joint Venture and prescribes its operational practices and procedures.

(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to applicable Federal and State law, the Management Board shall manage the personnel and operations of the Joint Venture, including—

(i) by appointing a coordinator for the Joint Venture in consultation with the Director, to manage the daily and long-term operations of the Joint Venture;

(ii) approval of other full- or part-time administrative and technical non-Federal employees as the Management Board determines necessary to perform the functions of the Joint Venture, meet objectives specified in the Implementation Plan, and fulfill the purpose of this Act; and

(iii) establishment of committees, steering groups, focus groups, geographic or taxonomic

groups, or other organizational entities to assist in implementing the relevant Implementation Plan.

(4) **USE OF SERVICE AND FEDERAL AGENCY EMPLOYEES.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations and upon the request from a Management Board, and after consultation with and approval of the Director, the head of any Federal agency may detail to the Management Board, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, any agency personnel to assist the Joint Venture in performing its functions under this Act.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—

(1) **SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO DIRECTOR.**—Before the Director enters into an agreement to establish a Joint Venture under subsection (a), the Management Board for the Joint Venture shall submit to the Director a proposed Implementation Plan that shall contain, at a minimum, the following elements:

(A) A strategic framework for migratory bird conservation that includes biological planning; conservation design; habitat restoration, protection, and enhancement; applied research; and monitoring and evaluation activities.

(B) Provisions for effective communication among member participants within the Joint Venture.

(C) A long-term strategy to conduct public outreach and education regarding the purposes and activities of the Joint Venture and activities to regularly communicate to the general public information generated by the Joint Venture.

(D) Coordination with laws and conservation plans referred to in section 4(a)(3) and (4) that are relevant to migratory birds, and other relevant regional, national, or international initiatives identified by the Director to conserve migratory birds, their habitats, ecological functions, and associated populations of fish and wildlife.

(E) An organizational plan that—

(i) identifies the initial membership of the Management Board and establishes procedures for updating the membership of the Management Board as appropriate;

(ii) describes the organizational structure of the Joint Venture, including proposed committees and subcommittees, and procedures for revising and updating the structure, as necessary; and

(iii) provides a strategy to increase stakeholder participation or membership in the Joint Venture.

(F) Procedures to coordinate the development, implementation, oversight, monitoring, tracking, and reporting of conservation actions approved by the Management Board and an evaluation process to determine overall effectiveness of activities undertaken by the Joint Venture.

(G) A strategy to encourage the contribution of non-Federal financial resources, donations, gifts and in-kind contributions to support the objectives of the Joint Venture and fulfillment of the Implementation Plan.

(2) **REVIEW.**—The Director shall—

(A) coordinate the review of a proposed Implementation Plan submitted under this section; and

(B) ensure that such plan is circulated for review for a period not to exceed 90 days, to—

(i) bureaus within the Service and other appropriate bureaus or agencies within the Department of the Interior;

(ii) appropriate regional migratory bird Flyway Councils;

(iii) national and international boards that oversee bird conservation initiatives under the plans specified in section 4(a)(4);

(iv) relevant State agencies, regional governmental entities, and Indian tribes;

(v) nongovernmental conservation organizations, academic institutions, or other stakeholders engaged in existing Joint Ventures that have knowledge or expertise of the geographic or ecological scope of the Joint Venture; and

(vi) other relevant stakeholders considered necessary by the Director to ensure a com-

prehensive review of the proposed Implementation Plan.

(3) **APPROVAL.**—The Director shall approve an Implementation Plan submitted by the Management Board for a Joint Venture if the Director finds that—

(A) the plan provides for implementation of conservation actions to conserve waterfowl and other native migratory birds and their habitats and ecosystems either—

(i) in a specific geographic area of the United States; or

(ii) across the range of a specific species or similar group of like species;

(B) the members of the Joint Venture—

(i) accept the responsibility for implementation of national or international bird conservation plans in the region of the United States to which the plan applies; and

(ii) have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Director the capacity to implement conservation actions identified in the plan, including (I) the design, funding, monitoring, and tracking of conservation projects that advance the objectives of the Joint Venture; and (II) reporting and conduct of public outreach regarding such projects; and

(C) the plan maximizes, to the extent practicable, coordination with other relevant and active conservation plans or programs within the geographic scope of the Joint Venture to conserve, protect, recover, or restore migratory bird habitats and other fish and wildlife habitat within the operating region of the Joint Venture.

SEC. 6. GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Director may award grants of financial assistance to implement a Joint Venture through—

(1) support of the activities of the Management Board of the Joint Venture and to pay for necessary administrative costs and services, personnel, and meetings, travel, and other business activities; and

(2) support for specific conservation actions and other activities necessary to carry out the Implementation Plan.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—A Joint Venture is not eligible for assistance or support authorized in this section unless the Joint Venture is operating under an Implementation Plan approved by the Director under section 5.

(c) **CONSERVATION ACTION GRANT CRITERIA.**—The Secretary, through the Director, within 180 days after date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with representatives from Management Boards and equivalent entities of joint ventures referred to in section 8, shall publish guidelines for determining funding allocations among joint ventures and priorities for funding among conservation action proposals to meet the purpose of this Act and respective Implementation Plans.

(d) **MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.**—If a Management Board determines that two or more proposed conservation actions are of equal value toward fulfillment of the relevant Implementation Plan, priority shall be given to the action or actions for which there exist non-Federal matching contributions that are equal to or exceed the amount of Federal funds available for such action or actions.

(e) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary, through the Director, may provide technical and administrative assistance for implementation of Joint Ventures and the expenditure of financial assistance under this subsection.

(f) **ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DONATIONS.**—The Secretary, through the Director, may accept and use donations of funds, gifts, and in-kind contributions to provide assistance under this section.

SEC. 7. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS BY MANAGEMENT BOARDS.**—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall—

(A) require each Management Board to submit annual reports for all approved Joint Ventures of the Management Board; and

(B) publish within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act guidelines to implement this subsection.

(2) *CONTENTS.*—Each annual report shall include—

(A) a description and justification of all conservation actions approved and implemented by the Management Board during the period covered by the report;

(B) when appropriate based upon the goals and objectives of an Implementation Plan, an estimate of the total number of acres of migratory bird habitat either restored, protected, or enhanced as a result of such conservation actions;

(C) the amounts and sources of Federal and non-Federal funding for such conservation actions;

(D) the amounts and sources of funds expended for administrative and other expenses of the Joint Venture of the Management Board, including all donations, gifts, and in-kind contributions provided for the Joint Venture;

(E) the status of progress made in achieving the strategic framework of the Implementation Plan of such Joint Venture and fulfillment of the purpose of this Act; and

(F) other elements considered necessary by the Director to insure transparency and accountability by Management Boards in the implementation of its responsibilities under this Act.

(b) *JOINT VENTURE PROGRAM FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall at five years after the date of enactment of this Act and at five-year intervals thereafter, complete an objective and comprehensive review and evaluation of the Program.

(2) *REVIEW CONTENTS.*—Each review under this subsection shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Program in meeting the purpose of this Act specified in section 2(b);

(B) an evaluation of all approved Implementation Plans, especially the effectiveness of existing conservation strategies, priorities, and methods to meet the objectives of such plans and fulfill the purpose of this Act; and

(C) recommendations to revise the Program or to amend or otherwise revise Implementation Plans to ensure that activities undertaken pursuant to this Act address the effects of climate change on migratory bird populations and their habitats, and fish and wildlife habitats, in general.

(3) *CONSULTATION.*—The Secretary, acting through the Director, in the implementation of this subsection—

(A) shall consult with other appropriate Federal agencies with responsibility for the conservation or management of fish and wildlife habitat and appropriate State agencies; and

(B) may consult with appropriate, Indian tribes, Flyway Councils, or regional conservation organizations, public and private landowners, members of academia and the scientific community, and other nonprofit conservation or private stakeholders.

(4) *PUBLIC COMMENT.*—The Secretary, through the Director, shall provide for adequate opportunities for general public review and comment of the Program as part of the five-year evaluations conducted pursuant to this subsection.

SEC. 8. TREATMENT OF EXISTING JOINT VENTURES.

For purposes of this Act, the Director—

(1) shall treat as a Joint Venture any joint venture recognized by the Director before the date of the enactment of this Act in accordance with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service manual (721FW6); and

(2) shall treat as an Implementation Plan an implementation plan adopted by the management board for such joint venture.

SEC. 9. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.

(a) *AUTHORITIES, ETC. OF SECRETARY.*—Nothing in this Act affects authorities, responsibilities, obligations, or powers of the Secretary under any other Act.

(b) *STATE AUTHORITY.*—Nothing in this Act preempts any provision or enforcement of a State statute or regulation relating to the management of fish and wildlife resources within such State.

SEC. 10. FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to any boards, committees, or other groups established under this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2188, the Joint Ventures for Bird Habitat Conservation Act of 2009, sponsored by our colleague from Maryland, Representative FRANK KRATOVIL. This bill seeks to highlight the critical importance that migratory birds have with our economy as well as their importance as a bellwether of the health of our environment. However, due to their wide distribution, the only way we can maintain this resource is to work cooperatively, creatively and purposefully with other nations and with all stakeholders to conserve migratory bird habitat.

The gentleman from Maryland's legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of voluntary Migratory Bird Joint Ventures to establish durable partnerships to conserve bird habitat over entire geographic regions, thereby developing effective long-term strategies to conserve our common migratory bird resource for the benefit of all. The bill is broadly supported by conservation and hunting interests, the States as well as the administration. With that, I commend Mr. KRATOVIL for his leadership on this issue, and I ask Members to support passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 2188 would statutorily establish the existing Migratory Bird Joint Venture program. This program, which has been funded as an administrative line item in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service budget for over 20 years, has done a remarkable job of conserving some 15.7 million acres of grasslands, forests, wetlands and riparian habitat throughout North America.

By enacting this program into law, we will send a positive message to the

international community that the United States is committed to its wildlife treaty obligations. We will also ensure that Congress has an opportunity to periodically examine this program to evaluate its ongoing effectiveness and whether it merits the further expenditure of our taxpayer money in the future.

I would like to recognize the other three bipartisan sponsors of this legislation: Congressmen FRANK KRATOVIL, RON KIND, and ROB WITTMAN.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL).

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Maryland is defined by a national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay and the surrounding watershed. During the winter the wetlands and surrounding habitat of the bay are home to a significant population of migratory waterfowl, including American black ducks, mallards, canvasbacks and Canada geese. However, too many of these birds and their habitats are at risk. Protecting these birds is vital because they play an integral role in the ecosystems across the country and serve as invaluable harbingers of environmental change. Protecting their habitats is also imperative to our constituents, who consider themselves passionate outdoorsmen and -women.

Part of our culture and heritage on Maryland's Eastern Shore and elsewhere in the country includes activities such as bird-watching, hunting, hiking, kayaking and fishing. In fact, according to a 2006 survey conducted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 1.6 million individuals participate in hunting and wildlife-watching activities across the State of Maryland, leading to a total of nearly \$844 million in economic activity within the region. Waterfowl hunting alone was responsible for 726 jobs and nearly \$10 million in State and Federal tax revenue in Maryland. Needless to say, birds in Maryland have a significant recreational, economic and ecological impact. However, for us to have an environment and wildlife that future generations can enjoy, it is essential that we support effective habitat conservation. Joint ventures are effective, voluntary, public-private partnerships designed to protect, restore, enhance and manage migratory bird populations, their habitats and ecosystems.

I was pleased to introduce H.R. 2188, as has already been mentioned by my colleague, along with colleagues HENRY BROWN of South Carolina, Representative RON KIND of Wisconsin and Representative ROB WITTMAN of Virginia. The legislation establishes a voluntary joint venture program, administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service in coordination with other Federal agencies and the States to develop, implement and support cooperative and effective conservation strategies that promote sustainable bird populations, encourage

stakeholder and government partnerships, implement science-driven, landscape-level bird conservation strategies and coordinate related conservation activities. Joint ventures have already leveraged funds and science-based data to protect, restore or enhance over 13 million acres of habitat across this country. Joint ventures falling under the North American Waterfowl Management Plan have invested \$4.5 billion to conserve 15.7 million acres of waterfowl habitat. The Atlantic Coast Joint Venture, of which Maryland is a member, focuses on bird habitat in the Atlantic Flyway. The efforts of this joint venture have positively impacted over 280,000 acres across Maryland. Joint ventures successfully coordinate the activities of various stakeholders to protect migratory birds and conserve their habitats. Joint ventures, in sum, are an exemplary model that enjoy strong bipartisan support.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation on behalf of all of their constituents who seek to preserve and enjoy both these migratory birds and their habitats.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from South Carolina for his leadership on this issue and for allowing me to speak for a few moments. This is clearly a bill that is supported on a bipartisan basis and something that ought to move forward. It's something that many care about. I would suggest, however, that what the American people mainly care about right now are the economy and jobs. The economy, spending, borrowing, the national debt.

The national debt, as of June 30, stood at \$11,545,275,346,431. Mr. Speaker, I know that's hard to believe; but that's \$37,609.23 for every man, woman and child in America. And over the last month, our national debt has increased by \$223.7 billion, a remarkable amount of increase. Since the Democrats took control of Congress in January of 2007, the national debt has increased \$2.9 trillion. That's over \$9,300 a person. At the end of April, the U.S. Government owed China \$763.5 billion. This year alone our debt to China has increased by over \$36 billion. So the economy is front and center for the American people. It is what is causing them the greatest amount of heartache and the greatest amount of concern. It's what moms and dads across this land are worried about when they tuck their kids in at night. The American people are hurting. Millions of Americans are out of work, and hundreds of thousands continue to lose their jobs each and every month.

Now the present administration, the Obama administration, and the Democrats in charge here in Congress promised that their trillion-dollar "stimulus" package would create jobs immediately, they said, and unemployment wouldn't rise over 8 percent if their

program was adopted. President Obama, in fact, said recently that the stimulus bill had "done its job" and is "working exactly as we anticipated." Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that comes as a surprise to the American people, as 1.96 million Americans have lost their jobs since the stimulus was enacted. I'm not quite certain that they believe the stimulus has "done its job" and worked exactly as they anticipated. In June alone almost 500,000 jobs were lost, increasing unemployment to 9.5 percent, the highest level in 26 years. So it's clear that the trillion-dollar stimulus package isn't working, Mr. Speaker; and the American people have a right to know, where are the jobs, where are the jobs?

Now the good news is that Republicans have a real plan, a real plan for a real recovery—fiscal discipline here in Washington; tax relief for working families, small businesses and family farms, the job creation engine of our Nation. So the American people deserve a recovery plan. They do, indeed. They deserve a plan that puts Americans back to work. No more borrowing, no more spending, no more unemployment. Mr. Speaker, the good news is that Republicans have a positive plan, positive solutions for the economy, for jobs, for energy self-sufficiency and, yes, for health reform. So whether it's the economy and jobs that the American people are concerned about, whether it's being able to put gasoline in their cars so they can get to work for their second or third job, trying to make ends meet at home, whether it's providing health care for themselves and their families, positive solutions do exist. The American people want us, as a Congress, to embrace those positive solutions, and I urge the Congress to act in a positive way.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time and would inquire of the minority if they have any additional speakers.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I have no further speakers and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Again, I urge Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2188, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LOS PADRES FOREST LAND CONVEYANCE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 129) to authorize the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Los Padres National Forest in California, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 129

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST, CALI- FORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary of Agriculture may convey to the White Lotus Foundation all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property within the Los Padres National Forest in California described in subsection (b).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The real property subject to conveyance under this Act is certain land located in Santa Barbara County, California, consisting of approximately 5 acres, as shown on the map titled "San Marcos Pass Encroachment for Consideration of Legislative Remedy", dated June 1, 2009.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under this Act shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) VALUATION.—Any appraisal of the real property to be conveyed under this Act shall conform to the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions, and the appraisal shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(e) CONSIDERATION.—Consideration for conveyance of real property under this Act shall be in an amount not less than the appraised fair market value.

(f) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the conveyance of real property under this Act shall be deposited in the fund established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act"; 16 U.S.C. 484a). The amount so deposited shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, for expenditure in the Los Padres National Forest.

(g) PRE-EXISTING RIGHTS.—As a condition of the conveyance authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary shall require the White Lotus Foundation to continue to allow existing access to any roadway that may be conveyed by this Act.

(h) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this Act as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(i) SURVEY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The White Lotus Foundation shall pay the reasonable costs of survey, appraisal, and any other administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 129 was introduced by our colleague from California, Representative ELTON GALLEGLEY. The bill would authorize the Forest Service to sell 5 acres of land within the Los Padres National Forest to resolve an encroachment issue. A portion of a small business owned by the White Lotus Foundation sits on 5 acres of the national forest. The 5 acres in question are separated from the majority of the forest by a road. The foundation was unaware of the encroachment when it purchased the land. Under the terms of the legislation, the White Lotus Foundation will be responsible for all the costs associated with the conveyance, including any necessary reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Mr. Speaker, we support passage of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 129 corrects a problem resulting from the way a small section of the Los Padres National Forest boundary crosses an old road. This road provides the only access to property owned by the White Lotus Foundation. This bill authorizes the Secretary to sell five acres to the foundation and requires that the sale be accomplished at no cost to the taxpayers.

I support the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, the author of the bill, Mr. GALLEGLEY.

(Mr. GALLEGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlelady from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), my good friend, for her work on this; and I rise today in strong support of H.R. 129.

This bill would authorize the Forest Service to convey a small parcel of land on the perimeter of the Los Padres National Forest to a nonprofit organization, the White Lotus Foundation. In 1983, the White Lotus Foundation inherited property in the hills above Santa Barbara, California, on the border of Los Padres National Forest. After operating in the location for over 25 years, the Forest Service sent a letter to the White Lotus Foundation notifying them of a parcel that was 0.05 acres, just a few actual square feet, of encroachment on the Forest Service land. It required them to remove all encroachments by December 31, 2008, or they would begin enforcement action.

The encroachment in question is located on a loop of the only road that

allows White Lotus and the rest of the public access to and from the White Lotus property. Due to the steep topography, the foundation has no other reasonable alternatives.

The loop lies on flat ground which was held for the purpose of providing space for equipment storage for fire and flood emergencies and provided access to a water pump and other necessary equipment. There is no other flat ground on which to move these items, and without this space, the foundation would be forced to cease operations.

My legislation will not cost the taxpayers a single penny. The White Lotus Foundation will pay for the land, the survey, and all administrative costs. There are no exemptions from NEPA or other environmental laws. The land in question is not protected by wilderness or any other specifically designated area.

Finally, my legislation does not even mandate this land be conveyed. It merely allows the Forest Service to convey the land and to determine the amount to be conveyed; meaning, if the Forest Service does not feel this land conveyance is in its best interest, it does not have to sell any Federal land to the White Lotus Foundation.

In closing, I want to thank the chairman, Chairman RAHALL, Ranking Member Mr. HASTINGS, for allowing this legislation to be considered today; and I urge support of this legislation, H.R. 129.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests of time and would inquire of the minority whether they have additional speakers.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I think we have one more speaker.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. BROWN from South Carolina, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and want to remind the American public, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to them, that we have a tremendous Federal debt and deficit that's growing every moment that this Congress is in session.

We have a tremendous amount of resources all across this country in forests, in Federal property; and I believe we must be good stewards of our environment. It's absolutely critical. In fact, we are charged from a biblical perspective to be good stewards of our environment, and I am a conservationist of the first order. In fact, I began my political activism being involved in the conservation movement. I'm a life member of many conservation movements such as the Wild Sheep Foundation, the Safari Club International, where I was a political action vice president, political affairs vice president for Safari Club International. I'm a member of Quail Unlimited,

Ducks Unlimited, and I can go on and on. So my conservation credentials are very numerous.

But we have Federal property all over this country where the Federal Government is not managing it properly. The Park Service can't take care, by their own admission, of the Federal National Park System today. The Forest Service does a much better job than the Park Service does in managing its properties. But we have national forests all over this country that have timber growing. It's a renewable resource.

Mr. Speaker, we can handle some of this Federal deficit and debt by starting to manage these Federal properties in a more responsible, scientific manner that will not harm the environment, will not harm the properties, will not harm—actually will help the wildlife.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support this legislation, I ask this House, I ask this Congress, I ask the American people to start demanding good management practices of our natural resources, and that's going to include good, responsible wildlife management; that's going to include considering hunting on all Federal properties as a management tool which is absolutely critical in proper wildlife management.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this legislation. I assume that it will pass, and I hope that it does. But we need to look beyond that and start being good stewards of our environment, and we have not been.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 129, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 377, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—23

Bachus	Hensarling	Shadegg
Bartlett	Johnson (IL)	Shea-Porter
Barton (TX)	King (IA)	Souder
Blackburn	Olson	Stark
Broun (GA)	Paul	Sullivan
Campbell	Pence	Tiahrt
Chaffetz	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Flake	Sessions	

NAYS—377

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hoekstra
Ackerman	Cuellar	Johnson (IL)
Aderholt	Culberson	Jackson-Lee
Adler (NJ)	Cummings	(TX)
Akin	Dahlkemper	Jenkins
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam
Arcuri	Davis (TN)	Jones
Austria	Deal (GA)	Jordan (OH)
Baca	DeFazio	Kagen
Bachmann	DeGette	Kanjorski
Baldwin	Delahunt	Kaptur
Barrow	DeLauro	Kennedy
Bean	Dent	Kildee
Becerra	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick (MI)
Berkley	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilroy
Berry	Dicks	Pitts
Biggert	Dingell	Platts
Bilbray	Doggett	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Donnelly (IN)	
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	
Bishop (NY)	Dreier	
Blumenauer	Driebehaus	
Blunt	Duncan	
Bocieri	Edwards (MD)	
Boehner	Edwards (TX)	
Bonner	Ehlers	
Bono Mack	Ellison	
Boozman	Ellsworth	
Boren	Emerson	
Boswell	Engel	
Boucher	Eshoo	
Boustany	Etheridge	
Boyd	Fallin	
Brady (PA)	Farr	
Brady (TX)	Fattah	
Braley (IA)	Fleming	
Bright	Forbes	
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	
Brown, Corrine	Foster	
Brown-Waite,	Fox	
Ginny	Frank (MA)	
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	
Burton (IN)	Fudge	
Butterfield	Gallegly	
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	
Calvert	Giffords	
Camp	Gingrey (GA)	
Cantor	Gonzalez	
Cao	Goodlatte	
Capito	Gordon (TN)	
Capps	Granger	
Capuano	Graves	
Cardoza	Grayson	
Carney	Green, Al	
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	
Carter	Griffith	
Cassidy	Guthrie	
Castle	Hall (NY)	
Castor (FL)	Hall (TX)	
Chandler	Halvorson	
Childers	Hare	
Clarke	Harman	
Cleaver	Harper	
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	
Coble	Heinrich	
Coffman (CO)	Heller	
Cohen	Herger	
Cole	Herseth Sandlin	
Conaway	Higgins	
Connolly (VA)	Hill	
Cooper	Himes	
Costa	Hinchey	
Costello	Hinojosa	
Courtney	Hirono	
Crenshaw	Hodes	

McIntyre	Polis (CO)	Skelton
McKeon	Pomeroy	Slaughter
McMahon	Posey	Smith (NE)
McMorris	Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Rodgers	Putnam	Smith (WA)
McNerney	Quigley	Snyder
Meek (FL)	Radanovich	Space
Meeks (NY)	Rahall	Spratt
Melancon	Rehberg	Stearns
Mica	Reichert	Stupak
Michaud	Reyes	Tanner
Miller (FL)	Richardson	Taylor
Miller (MI)	Rodriguez	Teague
Miller, Gary	Roe (TN)	Terry
Miller, George	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Minnick	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Mitchell	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Moore (KS)	Rooney	Tiberi
Moore (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Titus
Murphy (CT)	Ross	Tonko
Murphy (NY)	Rothman (NJ)	Towns
Murphy, Patrick	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Murphy, Tim	Royce	Turner
Murtha	Ruppersberger	Upton
Myrick	Rush	Van Hollen
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Napolitano	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Neal (MA)	Salazar	Walden
Neugebauer	Sanchez, Linda	Walz
Nunes	T.	Wamp
Nye	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Oberstar	Sarbanes	Schultz
Obey	Scalise	Waters
Oliver	Schauer	Watson
Ortiz	Schiff	Watt
Pallone	Schmidt	Waxman
Pascarella	Schock	Weiner
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Welch
Paulsen	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Payne	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (OH)
Peters	Serrano	Wilson (SC)
Peterson	Sherman	Wittman
Petri	Shinkus	Wolf
Pingree (ME)	Shuler	Woolsey
Pitts	Shuster	Wu
Platts	Simpson	Yarmuth
Poe (TX)	Sires	

NOT VOTING—32

Baird	Grijalva	Perriello
Barrett (SC)	Gutierrez	Rangel
Berman	Hastings (WA)	Schakowsky
Bishop (UT)	LaTourette	Schrader
Carnahan	Linder	Sestak
Clay	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Davis (IL)	McCauley	Sutton
Filner	McCollum	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Miller (NC)	Young (FL)
Gohmert	Moran (VA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (During the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1547

Messrs. BOUCHER, AL GREEN of Texas, KAGEN, HOYER, and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 532, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

LAS VEGAS MOTOR SPEEDWAY LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 409) to provide for the conveyance

of certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 115 acres of Bureau of Land Management land identified on the map as “Lands identified for Las Vegas Speedway Parking Lot Expansion”.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map titled “Las Vegas Speedway Parking Lot Expansion”, dated March 6, 2009, and on file in the Office of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO NEVADA SPEEDWAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If Nevada Speedway, LLC, submits to the Secretary an offer to acquire the Federal land for the appraised value, notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of section 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to Nevada Speedway, LLC, all right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land, subject to valid existing rights.

(b) APPRAISAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the Federal land.

(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—The appraisal under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(3) COSTS.—All costs associated with the appraisal required under paragraph (1) shall be paid by Nevada Speedway, LLC.

(c) PAYMENT OF CONSIDERATION.—As a condition of the conveyance, Nevada Speedway, LLC, shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal land, as determined under subsection (b).

(d) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of the conveyance, any costs of the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be paid by Nevada Speedway, LLC.

(e) REVERSION.—If Nevada Speedway, LLC, or any subsequent owner of the Federal land conveyed under subsection (a), uses the Federal land for purposes other than a parking lot for the Nevada Motor Speedway, all right, title, and interest in and to the land (and any improvements to the land) shall revert to the United States at the discretion of the Secretary.

(f) COMPLIANCE.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the conveyance authorized in this section shall be carried out in compliance with all laws and regulations applicable to the conveyance of Federal land.

SEC. 3. WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Except as provided in section 2(a) and subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) TERMINATION.—If two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the conveyance authorized under section 2 has not

been executed, the withdrawal under subsection (a) shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 4. SUNSET.

The authority provided to the Secretary under this Act shall terminate 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 409, introduced by Congressman DEAN HELLER, would provide for the conveyance of certain Bureau of Land Management land in Nevada to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway for use as a parking lot.

The Las Vegas Motor Speedway hosts NASCAR and other racing events and can draw as many as 100,000 racing fans to these races. For several years now, the Speedway has been looking for options to expand its parking and accommodate the growing number of fans attending this event.

H.R. 409 would require the conveyance of 115 acres of Bureau of Land Management land to the owners of the Speedway specifically for expansion of the parking lot. This land is adjacent to the land owned by the Speedway which is already used for a parking lot.

The bill further provides that the land be withdrawn from public land, mining, and mineral leasing laws and must be used only as a parking lot. I would add that the Bureau of Land Management supports this conveyance.

We have no objections to H.R. 409, and I urge its adoption by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 409 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Las Vegas Motor Speedway 115 acres adjacent to the Speedway at fair market value. The Speedway attracts over 140,000 fans, and the additional acreage is needed to prevent the hazardous driving conditions that result from the backup of cars trying to park in inadequate facilities.

All costs associated with the conveyance, including the appraisal, will be paid by the Speedway. The bill also includes a reversionary clause that would return the land to the Department of Interior should it be used for anything other than a parking lot.

Mr. HELLER should be commended for his work on this bill. I congratulate

him for his efforts to reduce—however small—the Federal Government land inventory.

I support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. I rise in support of this bill. I like the land transfer aspects of this bill because it's important when we can use Federal lands to address a pressing need, unlike the cap-and-tax energy bill, which tried to address a woody biomass provision which would allow excess wood of decayed trees to be used in the renewable fuel standard. That was one provision of many provisions which really identified the failure of the national energy tax and the cap-and-trade bill.

Now, I have promised to continue to come down to the floor to talk about the failed policy of that bill, the bipartisan "no" vote of that bill, and basically about the concerns that I have of my miners in southern Illinois, and really the attack on fossil fuels in this country.

If you have a raceway and a speedway, they are the epitome of either the renewable fuels, as some of the high-speed dragsters are actually ethanol-based fuels, or the technology and the efficiency of reusing fossil fuels in the ability to really compete and improve fossil fuels—the basic foundation of a thriving economy and something that shouldn't be attacked; it should be incentivized.

So, this bill that allows for the transfer of Federal lands for a good process, it also speaks of how we need to look at other uses of Federal land, especially the woody biomass provisions, to say they ought to get renewable credits.

When you have Federal lands that are privately managed and you use the forestry aspects, those wood products get a renewable fuel credit. But those, based upon this energy bill, do not get the renewable credit.

So that was part of the failure of the bill, and that's why, really, the bipartisan vote on the cap-and-tax bill was a strong bipartisan "no" vote and primarily for other reasons which talked about Illinois coal miners in the last energy bill—1,200 coal miners from southern Illinois.

So what is our response to the energy needs that we have in this country? It's basically an all-of-the-above process, using woody biomass from our Federal lands, which gets the same credit as privately forested areas. It's also addressing the Outer Continental Shelf provisions; allowing oil and gas exploration; using those revenues to move to renewable technologies—wind and solar; addressing coal and electricity generation from coal. Also, liquid fuels

from that. That is a diversified energy portfolio. And of course the provisions of biofuels, which is what we address in the woody biomass provisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would just remind my colleagues and friends we had a very great debate and a tough vote two weeks ago, but this debate is not going to end. We're going to continue to talk about the effects of raising energy taxes in a time of economic downturn, and the provisions that have been passed in this Chamber, the bipartisan vote, was in opposition to that bill. And we will continue to talk on the floor about that failed policy.

Mr. BACA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, again, I urge all Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 409, as amended. The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING HOME SAFETY MONTH

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 543) expressing support for designation of June as "Home Safety Month".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 543

Whereas unintentional injuries in the home result in nearly 20,000 deaths and 21,000,000 medical visits on average each year;

Whereas the top 5 causes of unintentional home injury deaths are falls, poisoning, fires/burns, choking/suffocation, and drowning/submersion;

Whereas falls are the leading cause of home injury death among older adults in the United States, and the total direct costs associated with both fatal and non-fatal falls is more than \$19,000,000,000 annually for hospitalization, emergency department visits, and outpatient care;

Whereas poisonings are the second leading cause of home injury death in the United States, resulting in nearly 5,000 deaths per year;

Whereas fire and burn injuries are the third leading cause of home injury death and

almost two-thirds (65 percent) of reported home fire deaths resulted from fires in homes with no smoke alarms or no working smoke alarms;

Whereas deaths due to unintentional choking and suffocation injuries are the fourth leading cause of home injury death in the United States and nearly 25 percent of all choking and suffocation deaths occur in the home;

Whereas deaths due to drowning are the fifth leading cause of home injury death in the United States and an average of more than 10,000 events occur in the home each year that require medical care, emergency department treatment, and result in days away from work or school;

Whereas children and older adults have increased rates of unintentional home injury, compared with all other age groups;

Whereas citizens are encouraged to take a hands-on approach to home safety and become aware of the simple and inexpensive steps they can take to reduce the risk of injury in each area of the home; and

Whereas June would be an appropriate month to designate as "Home Safety Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of "Home Safety Month";

(2) recognizes the contributions of home safety related nonprofit organizations for their ongoing commitment to ensuring families remain safe in their homes;

(3) recognizes the contributions made by the Home Safety Council to the efforts of "Home Safety Month" for recently introducing a new and innovative online tool to help adults identify the dangers present in and around the home, designated as www.MySafeHome.org, and for promoting the Hands on Home Safety Campaign, whose goal is to educate and empower both families and businesses to take simple actions that will make homes safe and minimize their risk for potential injuries, or even death;

(4) encourages adults, parents, and caregivers to take greater actions to reduce unintentional injuries and educate themselves on the importance of home safety, for themselves and their loved ones;

(5) encourages manufacturers to develop innovative safety products and features to help lessen the number of home injuries and accidents; and

(6) encourages local and national government leaders to support funding for critical home safety education programs to reduce the risks from home injuries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unintentional injuries in the home result in nearly 200,000 deaths and 21 million medical visits on average each

year. The top five causes of unintentional home injury deaths are falls, poisonings, fires and burns, choking and suffocation, and finally, drowning.

Falls are the leading cause of home injury death among older adults in the United States, and the total direct costs associated with both fatal and nonfatal falls is more than \$19 billion annually for hospitalization, emergency department visits, and outpatient care.

Poisonings are the second leading cause of home injury deaths in the United States, resulting in nearly 5,000 deaths per year. Fire and burn injuries are the third leading cause of home injury death, and almost two-thirds, or 65 percent, of reported home fire deaths resulted from fires in homes with no smoke alarms or no working smoke alarms.

Deaths due to unintentional choking and suffocation injuries are the fourth leading cause of home injury death in the United States, and nearly 25 percent of all choking and suffocation deaths occur in the home.

□ 1600

Deaths due to drowning are the fifth leading cause of home injury death in the United States, and an average of more than 10,000 events occur in the home each year that require medical care, emergency department treatment, and/or result in days away from work and/or school.

Children and older adults have increased rates of unintentional home injury compared with all other age groups. Home Safety Month recognizes the contribution of home safety-related nonprofit organizations for their ongoing commitment to ensuring families remain safe in their homes.

As part of Home Safety Month, the Home Safety Council recently introduced a new and innovative online tool to help adults identify the dangers present in and around the home designated as www.mysafehome.org. Additionally, the Home Safety Council is also promoting the Hands on Home Safety campaign, whose goal is to educate and empower families, businesses and community leaders to take simple actions that will make homes safe and minimize their risk from potential injuries or even death.

This resolution encourages adults, parents and caregivers to take greater actions to reduce unintentional injuries and educate themselves on the importance of home safety for themselves and their loved ones. At the same time, it also encourages manufacturers to develop innovative safety projects and features to help lessen the numbers of home injuries and accidents, and finally encourages local and national government leaders to support funding for critical home safety education programs to reduce the risks from home injuries.

With that, Madam Speaker, I encourage the passage of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased and honored to be joining my colleague, Congresswoman HALVORSON from the great State of Illinois, in speaking for and managing the minority side in this debate.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 543, expressing support for the designation of June as "Home Safety Month." There have been recent stories that because of the economic downturn, many people are being driven to home repairs. I just put up two shades in the townhouse last night, and I probably can guarantee you that I didn't do it in the safest manner possible.

This is a simple resolution to again call upon the public to understand the dangers inherent around the home and to provide information using a tool available to help them identify areas around the home and what they can do to make their home more safe.

Each year there are nearly 20,000 deaths and 21 million medical visits caused by unintentional falls, people being poisoned, skin burns due to fires, choking hazards and drowning. Unfortunately, most of these hazards occur to the most vulnerable age groups, children and older adults. I encourage the adults, caregivers and parents to educate themselves on the importance of home safety for themselves and their loved ones.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Home Safety Council for their innovative online tool that helps adults identify the dangers that may exist in the home, and I also encourage others to look into the Hands on Home Safety campaign which was identified by my colleague, www.mysafehome.org. The Web site has made great efforts to educate families and businesses on how to avoid potential risks and injuries. I probably should have looked at that Web site before I attempted my little home repair last night.

I would like to thank the author, again, for this resolution, Mrs. DEBBIE HALVORSON of Illinois, for her leadership in helping Americans' well-being and addressing the safety in their homes. I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Speaker, I have no additional requests for speakers. I would like to inquire whether the minority has any additional speakers.

Mr. SHIMKUS. As far as I know, I have one more additional speaker.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague and friend, Congressman BROWN from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'm a physician, and I'm concerned about what goes on in people's homes and the safety in those homes. And I commend the sponsor of this bill for introducing it here before the House.

I think the American people are more concerned about other things now than just home safety. That is certainly everyone's concern, but I think their economic concerns are extremely important to the American people also, Madam Speaker. I also believe that energy independence is of extreme concern to the American people too. Republicans have offered alternatives to the tax-and-cap bill that this House passed just a couple of weeks ago. It is over in the Senate. In my opinion, it should die over there.

The American people must stand up and understand how this is going to increase the cost of not only their energy sources, but it is going to increase the cost of everything that they buy. Out of every dollar that they spend, some of it is going to come to the Federal Government in the nature of an increased energy tax which is going to be disastrous.

We on the Republican side have introduced legislation that would make America independent. But that bill has not seen the light of day on the floor of this House. Why is that? It is because the Democratic majority and the leadership will not allow that to happen. I think if that bill were to come to the floor of the House of Representatives, and the American people were to see it, we would pass it. But if we passed it over this huge energy tax that is in the tax-and-cap bill, then the revenue would not be available to pay for the health care bill. The President recently said he needed that revenue to pay for the health care bill that he has promoted and that is being introduced this week in the House of Representatives, "Obama Care."

And Obama Care, as a physician, I can tell you is going to be disastrous for my colleagues and me and for our patients because it is going to insert a Washington bureaucrat between the doctor and the patient, and that Washington bureaucrat is going to be making health care decisions. It is going to be extremely expensive.

Just last night, I held a tele-town hall meeting and asked a question of the people on the line about what concerns them about this Obama Care program that is being proposed by the Democrat majority. Overwhelmingly, they were concerned about the cost, as well as Washington bureaucrats inserting themselves in health care decisions. They were overwhelmingly concerned about the taxes that are going to go up for everybody in this country.

There are a lot of tax increases that we already know are going to be in this bill because we have seen the draft. We understand we are going to have the bill today in final form, at least the final form before all the manager's amendments and before markups are done.

We have a lot of things going on here that the American people need to understand are going to be disastrous for them, for their health care and for their economy. It is going to hurt people. It is going to hurt people because the economy is going to fall just like we are concerned about falls and other things in our home and home safety.

Our grandchildren are going to live at a lower standard than we live today if we keep passing these bills. We have got unprecedented debt. We have got unprecedented deficits. Right now, the most abused credit card in this country today is this card, the voting card that Members of Congress use. This is a credit card that the Chinese are picking up the debt that we are creating with the use of this card.

Madam Speaker, we have to stop this egregious, outrageous spending that this Congress is doing. It is going to kill the American economy. It is going to destroy the health care system that is being proposed in this health care bill that is being presented today. We have got to stop it, Madam Speaker. So it is not just about home safety. It is about economic well being. It is about our children's future.

Madam Speaker, it just grieves me to see the direction that this country is going. It grieves me to know what my two grandchildren that I have now are going to have to face in the way of paying back the debt that we cannot pay, my children can't pay and that my grandchildren and their children probably are going to have a hard time paying too.

So, Madam Speaker, we are heading in a bad, bad direction. The American people need to stand up and understand what is going on and say "no" to Obama Care, "no" to tax-and-cap, the so-called "cap-and-trade" bill, and "no" to all of this increased debt and increased deficits which are going to take away jobs that we have already seen in tremendous job losses, take away jobs, and it is going to ruin the economy.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for helping today with this bill. We in Illinois do a lot of things in a bipartisan way, and I just want to give him another thanks for helping out and for bringing awareness to home safety issues which are important to all of us. It is a topic that could save people money and their health given the ability that they always have to be aware of things so we can prevent accidents in our home.

Each year an average of more than 7,000 adults aged 65 and older die from unintentional home injuries. Falls alone account for 52.5 percent of all home injury deaths for adults aged 65 to 74.

With this, Madam Speaker, I just encourage everybody to support this and to bring about awareness to Home Safety Month.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 543.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 612, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 469, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1037, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 402, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF JUNE 22 METRORAIL CRASH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 612, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 612.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (UT)
Ackerman	Barrow	Blackburn
Aderholt	Bartlett	Blumenauer
Adler (NJ)	Barton (TX)	Blunt
Akin	Bean	Bocchieri
Alexander	Becerra	Boehner
Altmire	Berkley	Bonner
Andrews	Berman	Bono Mack
Arcuri	Berry	Boozman
Austria	Biggart	Boren
Baca	Bilbray	Boswell
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Boucher
Bachus	Bishop (GA)	Boustany
Baird	Bishop (NY)	Boyd

Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Manzullo	Royce	Skelton	Tsongas	Bilbray	Farr	Lewis (GA)
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Marchant	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Turner	Bilirakis	Fattah	Linder
Braley (IA)	Gordon (TN)	Markey (CO)	Rush	Smith (NE)	Upton	Bishop (GA)	Flake	Lipinski
Bright	Granger	Markey (MA)	Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Bishop (NY)	Fleming	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Graves	Marshall	Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Loebsack
Brown (SC)	Grayson	Massa	Salazar	Smith (WA)	Visclosky	Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda T.	Snyder	Walden	Blumenauer	Foster	Lowey
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Green, Gene	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Walz	Blunt	Fox	Lucas
Buchanan	Griffith	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes	Space	Wamp	Bocchieri	Frank (MA)	Luetkemeyer
Burgess	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise	Speier	Wasserman	Boehner	Franks (AZ)	Lujan
Burton (IN)	Guthrie	McCaul	Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz	Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Butterfield	Gutierrez	McClintock	Schauer	Stark	Waters	Bono Mack	Fudge	Lungren, Daniel E.
Buyer	Hall (NY)	McCollum	Schiff	Stearns	Watson	Boozman	Gallegly	Lynch
Calvert	Hall (TX)	McCotter	Schmidt	Stupak	Watt	Boren	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Camp	Halvorson	McDermott	Schock	Sullivan	Waxman	Boswell	Giffords	Maffei
Campbell	Hare	McGovern	Schwartz	Sutton	Weiner	Boucher	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney
Cantor	Harman	McHenry	Scott (GA)	Tanner	Welch	Boustany	Gohmert	Manzullo
Cao	Hastings (FL)	McHugh	Scott (VA)	Taylor	Westmoreland	Boyd	Gonzalez	Marchant
Capito	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner	Teague	Wexler	Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	Markey (CO)
Capps	Heinrich	McMahon	Serrano	Terry	Whitfield	Brady (TX)	Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)
Capuano	Heller	McMorris	Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (OH)	Bright	Granger	Marshall
Cardoza	Hensarling	McNerney	Shadegg	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)	Broun (GA)	Graves	Massa
Carney	Herger	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter	Thornberry	Wittman	Brown (SC)	Grayson	Matheson
Carson (IN)	Herseth Sandlin	Meeks (NY)	Sherman	Tiahrt	Wolf	Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	Matsui
Carter	Higgins	Melancon	Shimkus	Tiberi	Woolsey	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)
Cassidy	Hill	Mica	Shuster	Tierney	Wu	Cassidy	Griffith	McCollum
Castle	Himes	Michaud	Simpson	Titus	Yarmuth	Buchanan	Grijalva	McClintock
Castor (FL)	Hinche	Miller (FL)	Sires	Tonko	Young (AK)	Burgess	Guthrie	McCotter
Chaffetz	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)		Towns		Burton (IN)	Gutierrez	McDermott
Chandler	Hirono	Miller (NC)				Butterfield	Hall (NY)	McGovern
Childers	Hodes	Miller, Gary				Buyer	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Clarke	Hoekstra	Miller, George				Calvert	Halvorson	McHugh
Cleaver	Holden	Minnick				Camp	Hare	McIntyre
Clyburn	Holt	Mitchell				Campbell	Harman	McKeon
Coble	Honda	Mollohan				Cantor	Harper	McMahon
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Moore (KS)				Cao	Hastings (FL)	McMorris
Cohen	Hunter	Moore (WI)				Capito	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
Cole	Inglis	Moran (KS)				Capps	Heinrich	McNerney
Conaway	Inslee	Moran (VA)				Capuano	Heller	Meek (FL)
Connolly (VA)	Israel	Murphy (CT)				Cardoza	Hensarling	Meeks (NY)
Cooper	Issa	Murphy (NY)				Carney	Herger	Melancon
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick				Carson (IN)	Herseth Sandlin	Mica
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim				Carter	Higgins	Michaud
Courtney	(TX)	Murtha				Cassidy	Hill	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Myrick				Castle	Himes	Miller (MI)
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Nadler (NY)				Castor (FL)	Hinche	Miller (NC)
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano				Chaffetz	Hirono	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Neal (MA)				Chandler	Hodes	Miller, George
Dahlkemper	Jones	Neugebauer				Childers	Hoekstra	Minnick
Davis (AL)	Jordan (OH)	Nunes				Clarke	Holden	Mitchell
Davis (CA)	Kagen	Nye				Cleaver	Holt	Mollohan
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Oberstar				Clyburn	Honda	Moore (KS)
Davis (KY)	Kaptur	Obey				Coble	Hunter	Moore (WI)
Davis (TN)	Kennedy	Olson				Coffman (CO)	Inglis	Moran (KS)
Deal (GA)	Kildee	Oliver				Cohen	Inslee	Moran (VA)
DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz				Cole	Israel	Murphy (CT)
DeGette	Kilroy	Pallone				Conaway	Issa	Murphy (NY)
DeLauro	Kind	Pascarell				Connolly (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Delahunt	King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)				Cooper	Jackson-Lee	Murphy, Tim
DeLauro	King (NY)	Paul				Costa	(TX)	Murtha
Dent	Kingston	Paulsen				Costello	Jenkins	Myrick
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Payne				Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Nadler (NY)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pence				Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Napolitano
Dicks	Kissell	Perlmutter				Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)
Dingell	Klein (FL)	Perriello				Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer
Doggett	Kline (MN)	Peters				Culberson	Jones	Nunes
Donnelly (IN)	Kosmas	Peterson				Cummings	Jordan (OH)	Nye
Doyle	Kratovil	Petri				Dahlkemper	Kagen	Oberstar
Dreier	Kucinich	Pingree (ME)				Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Obey
Driehaus	Lamborn	Pitts				Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Olson
Duncan	Lance	Platts				Davis (IL)	Kennedy	Oliver
Edwards (MD)	Langevin	Poe (TX)				Davis (KY)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ortiz
Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)				Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Pallone
Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Pomeroy				Deal (GA)	Kind	Pascarell
Ellison	Latham	Posey				DeFazio	King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)
Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (GA)				DeGette	King (NY)	Paul
Engel	Latta	Price (NC)				DeLauro	Kingston	Paulsen
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Putnam				Dent	Kirk	Payne
Etheridge	Lee (NY)	Quigley				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Perlmutter
Fallin	Levin	Radanovich				Dicks	Kissell	Perriello
Farr	Lewis (CA)	Rahall				Dingell	Klein (FL)	Peters
Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rangel				Doggett	Kline (MN)	Peterson
Flake	Linder	Rehberg				Donnelly (IN)	Kosmas	Petri
Fleming	Lipinski	Reichert				Doyle	Kratovil	Pingree (ME)
Forbes	LoBiondo	Reyes				Dreier	Kucinich	Pitts
Fortenberry	Loebsack	Richardson				Driehaus	Lamborn	Platts
Foster	Lofgren, Zoe	Rodriguez				Duncan	Lance	Poe (TX)
Fox	Lowey	Roe (TN)				Edwards (MD)	Langevin	Polis (CO)
Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rogers (AL)				Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)				Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Posey
Frelinghuysen	Lujan	Rogers (MI)				Ellison	Latham	Price (GA)
Fudge	Lummis	Rohrabacher				Ellsworth	LaTourette	Price (NC)
Gallegly	Lungren, Daniel E.	Rooney				Emerson	Latta	Putnam
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen				Engel	Lee (CA)	Quigley
Gerlach	Mack	Roskam				Eshoo	Lee (NY)	Radanovich
Giffords	Maffei	Ross				Etheridge	Levin	Rahall
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney	Rothman (NJ)				Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rangel
Gohmert		Roybal-Allard						

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1638

Messrs. LUTKEMEYER, TERRY and BRALEY of Iowa changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 533, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

HONORING WAYMAN LAWRENCE TISDALE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 469, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 469.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Arcuri	Bartlett
Ackerman	Austria	Barton (TX)
Aderholt	Baca	Bean
Adler (NJ)	Bachmann	Becerra
Akin	Bachus	Berkley
Alexander	Baird	Berman
Altmire	Baldwin	Berry
Andrews	Barrow	Biggert

Rehberg Sensenbrenner Tiahrt
Reichert Serrano Tiberi
Reyes Sessions Tierney
Richardson Shadegg Titus
Rodriguez Shea-Porter Tonko
Roe (TN) Sherman Towns
Rogers (AL) Shimkus Tsongas
Rogers (KY) Shuler Upton
Rogers (MI) Shuster Van Hollen
Rohrabacher Simpson Velázquez
Rooney Sires Visclosky
Ros-Lehtinen Skelton Walden
Roskam Slaughter Walz
Ross Smith (NE) Wamp
Rothman (NJ) Smith (NJ) Wasserman
Roybal-Allard Smith (TX) Schults
Royce Smith (WA) Snyder
Ruppersberger Snyder Waters
Rush Souder Watson
Ryan (OH) Space Watt
Ryan (WI) Speler Waxman
Salazar Spratt Weiner
Sánchez, Linda Stark Welch
T. Stearns Westmoreland
Sanchez, Loretta Stupak Wexler
Sarbanes Sullivan Whitfield
Scalise Sutton Wilson (OH)
Schakowsky Tanner Wilson (SC)
Schauer Taylor Wittman
Schiff Teague Wolf
Schmidt Terry Woolsey
Schock Thompson (CA) Wu
Schwartz Thompson (MS) Yarmuth
Scott (GA) Thompson (PA) Young (AK)
Scott (VA) Thornberry

NOT VOTING—14

Barrett (SC) Filner Schrader
Carnahan Hinojosa Sestak
Clay Hoyer Turner
Conyers McCarthy (NY) Young (FL)
Delahunt Pence

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1647

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 534, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PILOT COLLEGE WORK STUDY PROGRAMS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1037, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1037, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]
YEAS—422
Abercrombie Davis (KY) Jordan (OH)
Ackerman Davis (TN) Kagen
Aderholt Deal (GA) Kanjorski
Adler (NJ) DeFazio Kaptur
Akin DeGette Kennedy
Delahunt Delahunt Kildee
DeLauro DeLauro Kilpatrick (MI)
Dent Kilroy Kilroy
Diaz-Balart, L. Kind King (IA)
Diaz-Balart, M. King (NY) Kingston
Dicks Doggett Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Dingell Donnelly (IN) Kissell
Doggett Doyle Klein (FL)
Dreier Dreier Kline (MN)
Driehaus Kosmas Kratovil
Duncan Kucinich Kucinich
Edwards (MD) Lamborn Lamborn
Edwards (TX) Ehlers Lance
Ehlers Ellison Langevin
Ellison Ellsworth Larsen (WA)
Emerson Engle Larson (CT)
Engel Latham Latham
Eshoo LaTourette LaTourette
Etheridge Latta Latta
Fallin Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
Farr Lee (NY) Lee (NY)
Fattah Levin Lewis (CA)
Flake Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA)
Fleming Linder Linder
Forbes Lipinski Lipinski
Fortenberry LoBiondo LoBiondo
Foster Loebach Loebach
Foxy Frank (MA) Frank (MA)
Frank (MA) Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen Lucas Lucas
Fudge Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
Gallegly Luján Luján
Garrett (NJ) Lummis Lummis
Gerlach Lungren, Daniel Lungren, Daniel
Giffords E. Lynch
Gingrey (GA) Gohmert Gohmert
Bright Gonzalez Gonzalez
Broun (GA) Goodlatte Goodlatte
Brown (SC) Gordon (TN) Gordon (TN)
Brown, Corrine Granger Granger
Ginny Graves Graves
Buchanan Grayson Grayson
Burgess Green, Al Green, Al
Burton (IN) Green, Gene Green, Gene
Butterfield Griffith Griffith
Buyer Grijalva Grijalva
Calvert Guthrie Guthrie
Camp Gutierrez Gutierrez
Campbell Hall (NY) Hall (NY)
Cantor Hall (TX) Hall (TX)
Cao Halvorson Halvorson
Capito Hare Hare
Capps Harman Harman
Capuano Harper Harper
Cardoza Hastings (FL) Hastings (FL)
Carney Hastings (WA) Hastings (WA)
Carson (IN) Heinrich Heinrich
Carter Heller Heller
Cassidy Hensarling Hensarling
Castle Herger Herger
Castor (FL) Herseth Sandlin Herseth Sandlin
Chaffetz Higgins Higgins
Chandler Hill Hill
Childers Himes Himes
Clarke Hinchey Hinchey
Cleaver Hinojosa Hinojosa
Clyburn Hirono Hirono
Coble Hodes Hodes
Coffman (CO) Hoekstra Hoekstra
Cohen Holden Holden
Cole Holt Holt
Conaway Honda Honda
Connolly (VA) Hunter Hunter
Cooper Inglis Inglis
Costa Inslee Inslee
Costello Israel Israel
Courtney Issa Issa
Crenshaw Jackson (IL) Jackson (IL)
Crowley Jackson-Lee Jackson-Lee
Cuellar (TX) Jenkins Jenkins
Culberson Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
Cummings Johnson (IL) Johnson (IL)
Dahlkemper Johnson, E. B. Johnson, E. B.
Davis (AL) Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
Davis (CA) Jones Jones
Davis (IL)

Napolitano Ros-Lehtinen Stearns
Neal (MA) Roskam Stupak
Neugebauer Ross Sullivan
Nunes Rothman (NJ) Sutton
Nye Roybal-Allard Tanner
Oberstar Royce Taylor
Obey Ruppersberger Teague
Olson Rush Terry
Oliver Ryan (OH) Thompson (CA)
Ortiz Ryan (WI) Thompson (MS)
Pallone Salazar Thompson (PA)
Pascarella Sánchez, Linda Thornberry
Pastor (AZ) T. Sanchez, Loretta Tiahrt
Paul Sanchez, Loretta Tiberi
Paulsen Sarbanes Tierney
Payne Scalise Titus
Pence Schakowsky Tonko
Perlmutter Schauer Towns
Perriello Schiff Tsongas
Peters Schmidt Turner
Peterson Schock Upton
Petri Schwartz Van Hollen
Pingree (ME) Scott (GA) Velázquez
Pitts Scott (VA) Visclosky
Platts Sensenbrenner Walden
Poe (TX) Serrano Walz
Polis (CO) Sessions Wamp
Pomeroy Shadegg Wasserman
Posey Shea-Porter Schults
Price (GA) Sherman Schults
Price (NC) Shimkus Waters
Putnam Shuler Watson
Quigley Shuster Watt
Radanovich Simpson Waxman
Rahall Sires Weiner
Rangel Skelton Welch
Rehberg Slaughter Westmoreland
Reichert Smith (NE) Wexler
Reyes Smith (NJ) Whitfield
Richardson Smith (TX) Wilson (OH)
Rodriguez Smith (WA) Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN) Snyder Wittman
Rogers (AL) Souder Wolf
Rogers (KY) Space Woolsey
Rogers (MI) Speler Wu
Rohrabacher Spratt Yarmuth
Rooney Stark Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Barrett (SC) Filner Sestak
Carnahan Hoyer Young (FL)
Clay Kirk
Conyers Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1656

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 535, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

WILLIAM C. TALLENT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OUTPATIENT CLINIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 402, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 402.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Cummings	Issa
Ackerman	Dahlkemper	Jackson (IL)
Aderholt	Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee
Adler (NJ)	Davis (CA)	(TX)
Akin	Davis (IL)	Jenkins
Alexander	Davis (KY)	Johnson (GA)
Altmire	Davis (TN)	Johnson (IL)
Andrews	Deal (GA)	Johnson, E. B.
Arcuri	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
Austria	DeGette	Jones
Baca	Delahunt	Jordan (OH)
Bachmann	DeLauro	Kagen
Bachus	Dent	Kanjorski
Baird	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy
Barrow	Dicks	Kildee
Bartlett	Dingell	Kilpatrick (MI)
Barton (TX)	Doggett	Kilroy
Bean	Donnelly (IN)	Kind
Becerra	Doyle	King (IA)
Berkley	Dreier	King (NY)
Berman	Driehaus	Kingston
Berry	Duncan	Kirk
Biggert	Edwards (MD)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Bilbray	Edwards (TX)	Kissell
Billirakis	Ehlers	Klein (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kline (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Ellsworth	Kratovil
Bishop (UT)	Emerson	Kucinich
Blackburn	Engel	Lamborn
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lance
Blunt	Etheridge	Langevin
Bocieri	Fallin	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Farr	Larson (CT)
Bonner	Fattah	Latham
Bono Mack	Flake	LaTourette
Boozman	Fleming	Latta
Boren	Forbes	Lee (CA)
Boswell	Fortenberry	Lee (NY)
Boucher	Foster	Levin
Boustany	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Brady (PA)	Franks (AZ)	Linder
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Braley (IA)	Fudge	LoBiondo
Bright	Gallely	Loeb
Brown (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown (SC)	Garlach	Lowe
Brown, Corrine	Giffords	Lucas
Brown-Waite,	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Ginny	Gohmert	Lujan
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Lummis
Burgess	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Burton (IN)	Gordon (TN)	E.
Butterfield	Granger	Lynch
Buyer	Graves	Mack
Calvert	Grayson	Maffei
Camp	Green, Al	Maloney
Campbell	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Cantor	Griffith	Marchant
Cao	Grijalva	Markey (CO)
Capito	Guthrie	Markey (MA)
Capps	Gutierrez	Marshall
Capuano	Hall (NY)	Massa
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	Matheson
Carney	Halvorson	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Hare	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Cassidy	Harper	McCaul
Castle	Hastings (FL)	McClintock
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Chaffetz	Heinrich	McCotter
Chandler	Heller	McDermott
Childers	Hensarling	McGovern
Clarke	Herger	McHenry
Cleaver	Herseth Sandlin	McHugh
Clyburn	Higgins	McIntyre
Coble	Hill	McKeon
Coffman (CO)	Himes	McMahon
Cohen	Hinche	McMorris
Cole	Hinojosa	Rodgers
Conaway	Hirono	McNerney
Connolly (VA)	Hodes	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hoekstra	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Holden	Melancon
Costello	Holt	Mica
Courtney	Honda	Michaud
Crenshaw	Hunter	Miller (FL)
Crowley	Inglis	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Inslee	Miller (NC)
Culberson	Israel	Miller, Gary

Miller, George	Rehberg	Souder
Minnick	Reichert	Space
Mitchell	Reyes	Speier
Mollohan	Richardson	Spratt
Moore (KS)	Rodriguez	Stark
Moore (WI)	Roe (TN)	Stearns
Moran (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
Murphy (CT)	Rogers (MI)	Sutton
Murphy (NY)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Murphy, Patrick	Rooney	Taylor
Murphy, Tim	Ros-Lehtinen	Teague
Murtha	Roskam	Terry
Myrick	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Nadler (NY)	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (MS)
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (PA)
Neal (MA)	Royce	Thornberry
Neugebauer	Rush	
Nunes	Ryan (OH)	
Nye	Ryan (WI)	
Oberstar	Salazar	
Obey	Sanchez, Linda	
Olson	T.	
Oliver	Sanchez, Loretta	
Ortiz	Sarbanes	
Pallone	Scalise	
Pascarella	Schakowsky	
Pastor (AZ)	Schauer	
Paul	Schiff	
Paulsen	Schmidt	
Payne	Schock	
Pence	Schwartz	
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	
Perriello	Sensenbrenner	
Peters	Serrano	
Peterson	Sessions	
Petri	Shadegg	
Pingree (ME)	Shea-Porter	
Pitts	Sherman	
Platts	Shimkus	
Poe (TX)	Shuler	
Polis (CO)	Shuster	
Pomeroy	Simpson	
Posey	Sires	
Price (GA)	Skelton	
Price (NC)	Slaughter	
Putnam	Smith (NE)	
Quigley	Smith (NJ)	
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	
Rahall	Smith (WA)	
Rangel	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—13

Barrett (SC)	Hoyer	Sestak
Carnahan	Kosmas	Wilson (SC)
Clay	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
Conyers	Schrader	
Filner	Scott (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1703

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 536, I was unable to vote, as I was in New York to receive an award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on July 14, 2009, I was not present and therefore missed the following votes:

On the passage of H. Res. 612, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On the passage of H. Res. 469, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

On the passage of H.R. 1037, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

On the passage of H.R. 402, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN A. BOEHNER, Republican Leader:

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to Section 4 of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act, (Public Law 111-25), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Elton Gallegly of California as a member of the Commission.

Mr. Gallegly has expressed interest in serving in this capacity and I am pleased to fulfill his request.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Republican Leader.

WHAT HAS CUBA DONE?

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss our relationship with our neighbor to the south, Cuba. I applaud President Obama for his plan to re-engage Cuba in a constructive dialogue and support his first steps to that end. But I must ask, what has Cuba done?

Improving the relationship between the United States and Cuba is something I strongly support, but I do not support this partnership at any cost.

I must ask, what has Cuba done? Cuba is still imprisoning political dissidents; Cuba still denies gay and lesbian citizens basic rights like freedom of assembly; Cuba still forbids travel outside the country without official permission.

We cannot tacitly reward this behavior by restoring normal relations with Cuba without asking what has Cuba done. Our ultimate progress is up to Cuba, and our shared diplomacy must be a two-way street.

HONORING DR. ROBERT STEELE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent who has been invaluable to Pennsylvania agriculture and has served with distinction at Penn State University. Dr. Robert Steele has been dean of the University's College of Agricultural Sciences since July 1, 1997. Dr. Steele has been in charge of Penn State's agricultural program, which includes 12 academic departments serving more than 3,000 students.

Under Dr. Steele's leadership, Penn State has performed significant agricultural research, and I'm grateful for

the support that Congress has shown over the years for this important work. Specific programs at Penn State that I proudly support include agricultural entrepreneurial alternatives, sustainable agriculture, dairy farm profitability, improved dairy management practices, and milk safety.

Dr. Steele is stepping down as dean and returning to the classroom.

Thank you, Dr. Steele, for your many years of service and your dedication to agriculture and higher education. I thank you, Dr. Steele, for your service and leadership. Pennsylvania agriculture is stronger for it.

ENSURING THERE ARE ENOUGH MEDICAID DOCTORS

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, you know we have a problem today in that many patients who are enrolled in Medicaid really face a tough time finding a doctor who will accept their coverage. A recent article in my hometown paper, *The Dallas Morning News*, highlighted the troubles of a young girl in north Texas covered by Medicaid. She couldn't find a doctor to treat her, stating that because of the lack of Medicaid doctors, "Medicaid patients often grow sicker while hunting for a doctor."

We have an obligation to ensure that Americans covered under Medicaid, who also happen to be some of our poorest and neediest patients, children and American pregnant women, can see the doctor they need to see when they need to see them. Expanding the number of Americans who qualify for Medicaid without first making certain that there are enough doctors to see those Medicaid patients is irresponsible and is a disservice to these individuals.

To avoid this crisis, I propose that the Federal Government undertake the changes necessary to address the barriers of access to a doctor for any government program. Throwing more Americans onto the rolls of government-run health care without first ensuring that there will be a doctor to see them is wrong. Coverage should equal access to a doctor and must be part of the national health care debate.

I encourage the people to go to my Web site, www.healthcaucus.org.

MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, the cost of defensive medicine is a major factor for skyrocketing health care prices for American families. Studies reveal some alarming facts: defensive medicine costs the United States \$170 billion per year; a third of orthopedists, obstetricians, trauma

surgeons, emergency room doctors, and plastic surgeons can expect to be sued in a given year; liability concerns have driven 7 to 8 percent of all OB/GYNs to stop practicing altogether; and data for 2006 show that 71 percent of all cases are either dropped or dismissed and only 1 percent result in a verdict for the plaintiff; and yet it still costs an average of \$25,000 just to defend a lawsuit even if no payment is awarded. The results are higher premiums, less access to treatments, and physician shortages in certain specialties.

Any real health care plan must include long-overdue medical liability reform. Without it, patients and doctors alike will suffer, and the cost of health care for all Americans will continue to go up.

AMERICA'S 33 CZARS

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, czarist Russia, 18 czars over a 300-year period of time. Czarist Obama Nation, America, 33 czars in 7 months, 33 czars who are running policy from Guantanamo Bay, to energy, to a \$790 billion stimulus package, to a myriad of other things and yet none of them have gone before the United States Senate for confirmation even though article II, section 2 of the Constitution says that the President should seek consent and advice from the U.S. Senate before appointing important policy people to his Cabinet.

Now, we do appoint and have the Senate confirm sub-Cabinet members, deputy Cabinet members, a myriad of judges—indeed hundreds if not thousands of people—but 33 people at a salary of \$172,000 each are running a parallel government without consent and approval. We need to stop this.

LAUS DEO

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, of course we have heard our President say we are not a Christian Nation. People can decide for themselves. But I thought it was worth pointing out that when the Washington Monument, right down the Mall from us, was dedicated, they put an aluminum-capped stone on it, four sides, there's writing on all four sides, but on the side that faced the Capitol were the Latin words "Laus Deo," Praise be to God.

Now, the reason they put that facing the Capitol was so that every day when the first rays of God's sun hit the very first thing in this Nation's Capitol, it was the words "Praise be to God." Every morning, the first rays of God's sun hit the first thing in the Capitol is "Praise be to God."

Just thought you ought to know.

REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today because we had a very important step in the history of America today. The House leadership announced a major initiative on health care reform: the 47 million-plus and growing number of uninsured Americans, the small businesses who get up every day and create the economic engine, the hardworking laborers who work every day, the children of America, just plain America is looking forward to a health reform package that gives a robust and vigorous public option without decreasing quality that says to hardworking Americans, No pre-existing disease or ailment in your family will ever break you again.

That allows for the strength of the integrity of the Federal Government to be a partner in working with those who wish to choose their own insurance which they already have. It is a fair balance, and it is paid for.

And so as we begin this debate, I'm excited to be able to announce that there will be savings, elimination of fraud and abuse, the opportunity for real health care reform.

□ 1715

OUR FINANCIAL INTEGRITY

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, this is a historic day but not for the reasons my colleague has just specified.

Today is the first day in American history the national deficit has reached \$1 trillion. We in this Congress have an obligation to do everything we can to preserve the financial integrity of this Nation for future generations, and as a Texan, I know the solution is very simple. It's one that is embodied in these wonderful stars which were worn by soldiers in the Army of the Republic of Texas.

This is a star worn by a young man who served in the Marine Corps of the Republic of Texas, and the lone star symbolizes for Texans that the solution is, to our problem as a Nation, just leave us alone. Let Texans run Texas. Stick to the Constitution.

The Federal Government needs to stick to the very limited powers set out in the Constitution and otherwise leave us alone. Stay away from my bank accounts, stay out of my pocket, get off my back, out of my way. Stay away from my home, my family, my kids, my job, my church, my synagogue.

Let Texans run Texas. Let Ohio run Ohio. That's what these young men were fighting for in the Army of the Republic of Texas, and that's what we,

as fiscal conservatives, are fighting for here today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMOS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS THE KEY TO SUCCESS IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, President Obama has said that our Nation's policy in Afghanistan rests on a three-legged stool. The three legs are: One, security, which means more troops; two, economic development; and three, helping the Afghan Government to do a better job of serving the needs of the Afghan people.

Last week, National Security Adviser James L. Jones gave a frank assessment about the strategy. He made it clear that the most important leg of the strategy is economic development. This is what he said, and I quote him: "This war will not be won by the military alone. We tried that for years. The piece of our strategy that has to work in the next year is economic development. If that is not done right, there are not enough troops in the world to succeed."

Madam Speaker, I welcome Jones' comments and agree with him completely about the importance of economic development. The administration must commit more to the economic strategy.

Look at the supplemental funding bill for Afghanistan which Congress passed last month and which I voted against and you will see that we have our priorities wrong. Ninety percent of the bill's funding goes toward purely military operations, while only 10 percent goes to support smart power, which includes economic development, humanitarian aid, and diplomacy. Madam Speaker, a 90/10 split favoring a military option is a doomed strategy that has virtually no chance of succeeding.

To win the battle for Afghanistan, we must show the Afghan people that the United States is helping build better lives for themselves. But after 7 years of occupation, the Afghan people don't see enough evidence that their lives are better now than they were before we arrived. In fact, in some ways, their lives have worsened. That's because we relied almost exclusively on the military leg of the stool and ignored economic development and the other elements of smart power. As a result, some Afghans now join the Taliban out of a sense of resentment and frustration. Some support the Taliban simply

because they are poor and the Taliban will pay them.

Mariam Nawabi, a former senior adviser to the Afghan American Chamber of Commerce and an activist for Afghan women, recently was asked what advice she would give President Obama, and here's what she said: "I would tell him to direct more money into economic development and the creation of jobs. To end the violence, the money needs to reach the villages. If the money doesn't get to the village itself, there is no change and the young men are left without support and become fodder for the Taliban."

Madam Speaker, we must redirect our mission in Afghanistan. We must shift our resources towards a civilian surge, a surge of experts and workers who can help the Afghan people to develop their economy, and our military forces actually could be redirected to support these efforts. We must also have a diplomatic surge, a surge that engages all of Afghanistan's neighbors in an effort to assist the Afghan people and shore up the central government.

In addition, we must develop a series of rigorous metrics to evaluate the progress of these efforts and report the results to the Congress of the United States and to the American people which will then send the message that our involvement in Afghanistan is not open-ended. We can also use this process to develop a timeline for the full redeployment of our troops and military contractors out of Afghanistan.

And finally, Madam Speaker, the government of Kabul must eliminate corruption. They must respect the rule of law and show that it is working on behalf of the Afghan people.

Madam Speaker, the previous administration failed in Afghanistan because it did not understand the importance of smart power. President Obama does. That's an important step forward. But our next step is to put smart power to work, which will bring peace to Afghanistan, and it will strengthen America's national security.

TAXES ARE THE ROOT OF ALL FEDERAL MISCHIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the taxacrats are at it again, cooking up new taxes to try to pay for the government takeover of health care. This time they want to raise taxes on small businesses. The so-called rich the taxacrats are targeting are America's entrepreneurs, the engine of the American economy.

Madam Speaker, taxes are the root of all Federal mischief. Businesses with less than 500 employees produce half of America's gross national product and account for the majority of our jobs. The taxacrats want to force these small businesses to buy health insurance for all of their employees, wheth-

er they can afford it or not. And if they don't, they will have to pay stiff fines, and of course, that will kill jobs.

The taxacrats also want to take \$540 billion in taxes out of budgets of small businesses to pay for their nationalized health care boondoggle. Small businesses need a tax break, not a tax hike.

Madam Speaker, it has always been the American entrepreneurial spirit creating new small businesses that have made this country work. There is an ebb and flow of businesses closing and new ones opening up. But these days, more are closing than opening. By the end of May, commercial bankruptcies were up 52 percent this year compared to the first five months of last year.

Eva Christian owns a popular European-style restaurant called Cafe Boulevard in Dayton, Ohio. She is one of the 8,300 businesses that have already filed for bankruptcy protection this year. Eva is trying to keep her cafe open and her workers employed while she tries to work things out with creditors. She says that the rising cost of food and energy combined with local unemployment have made it tough because her regular customers don't come around anymore. She cannot afford to be forced to give health care coverage to her employees, and her ability to bounce back will be smothered by the taxacrat not only health care proposals but new taxes on small businesses. So she will just close up.

Making matters worse, the high cost of energy is making everything cost more. The taxacrats refuse to expand the drilling for oil and natural gas here at home that would bring not only prices down but create millions of American jobs and not send them to Saudi Arabia. They want to kill the coal industry that supplies most of our electricity. They don't want to build more nuclear power plants that provide limitless clean energy. Their solution is to tax energy consumption on all Americans. All that will do is decrease the energy supply and cause energy costs to go up. There is no transition fuel and no energy source to transition to for at least 10 more years. That's not going to power our industries or fill anybody's gas tank so they can even get to work.

When the government took over General Motors and put it into bankruptcy, the small businesses nationwide that supplied the auto industry took a big hit. Seat belt manufacturers, floor mats, rearview mirrors, spark plugs, windshield wiper blades and electrical wires and washers, including hoses, belts and gaskets, all of the parts and pieces that come together to make automobiles, were losing jobs.

When big business files for bankruptcy, it affects the small businesses that supply them—small businesses, as you may recall, Madam Speaker, that got no bailout. They weren't important enough to keep from failing or politically influential with this administration, so they just went out of business.

When the new Government Motors put hundreds of their dealerships out of business, it hurt the local strip malls, restaurants, dry cleaners, grocery stores, sandwich shops, gas stations, on and on, and that causes financial struggles for the industries who supply these small businesses.

Madam Speaker, America's small businesses offer the best hope for new job creation. The government needs to get out of their way. Stop sucking the oxygen out of the economy with higher taxes and higher energy costs. Let America's entrepreneurs keep more of their own money to pull the country out of this mess. That says it in a nutshell: let them keep more of their own money.

Taxacrats want to control America's economic engine; however, they want to seize the wealth created in this country and spend it on their special friends and special interest groups. America's economy doesn't work that way. No economy ever has. If the government seizes the wealth it created, that these businesses created, however, it kills any incentive to create wealth. Just ask the former Soviet Union. Why do you think they went out of business? Why would anybody in their right mind invest money, blood, sweat, and tears to build a company from scratch only to hand the fruits of their labor over to the government? Governments don't create anything. They just seize it. They don't create jobs. They create taxpayer programs.

America's economy is the most successful in the history of the world, and the reason is easy to figure out: freedom. Freedom to create and grow an idea into a company, a dream to make it a multinational corporation. It makes no sense at all to kill the greatest economy on God's green earth, along with the freedom and liberty that created it. You cannot help the poor by economically killing the rich. It's been said, You don't make the poor rich by making the rich poor. Madam Speaker, taxes are the root of all Federal mischief.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1730

WE MUST SUPPORT AND DEFEND ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McMAHON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. Late Thursday, Madam Speaker, the House stood in support of our friend Israel and the greater global community by providing \$2.2 billion towards Israel's regional security and counterterrorism efforts. More importantly, this appropriation bill takes a firm stand against the active state sponsorship of terror by Iran by cutting off U.S. export credits to foreign companies that help to provide gasoline and other refined products to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Now I stand by the administration's decision to engage Iran through negotiations. However, the United States must have something concrete to negotiate with first. For this reason, I have strongly advocated for the use of sanctions to wean Iran away from its nuclear ambitions.

As for Israel, it is our fellow democracy, our tried and true ally. Supporting it is essential to the stability and future not only of the Middle East, but of the world. And any democratic nation that has chosen to treat Israel as a suspect state, to impose on Israel embargoes and daunting deadlines for a peace agreement, should know that its actions ultimately do damage to the shared values that all democracies espouse.

Our alliance with our European partners should be held in high regard—and it is. Yet, we must consistently work to maintain this relationship. Yet, a recent decision by the United Kingdom to revoke a number of arms export licenses to Israel following the Gaza war may trigger similar decisions by other EU nations, and comes at a crucial time for Israel's security.

Following the failed Iranian elections in June, the Iranian regime has had its legitimacy wounded and its paranoia increased. Many observers expect the regime to take a posture of increased repression at home and antagonism abroad. In that dangerous environment, Israel's leaders have every right to be concerned for their country's safety.

While hope still exists for a free Iran, Europe, Israel, and the United States must undoubtedly prepare for a more dangerous Iranian regime in the near term. We must be ready for the possibility that Iran will intensify its pursuit of nuclear weapons to overcome the embarrassment of the recent elections.

Incredibly, there seems to be a certain line of thinking in the international community that Iran poses no threat. For example, the day after Iran tested a 1,200-mile range Ashura ballistic missile and displayed the video footage to the world, a group of experts at the East-West Institute released a report on Iranian capabilities that made this astounding statement: "There is no reliable information at present on the state of Iran's efforts to develop solid-propellant rocket motors and therefore no basis to make this assessment."

It is this very shocking failure to prepare that puts Israel and the entire international community at risk. In this light, our European allies' decision to place an arms embargo on Israel does not merely represent a double standard, it is decidedly harmful to a democracy faced with the very real prospects of a destructive nuclear neighbor.

Madam Speaker, I urge this Congress and the United States to make the Iranian regime pay a higher cost for its nuclear weapons pursuit. If we needed

any further reminder, the protests in the streets of Tehran have made clear that words and actions mean very little to Ayatollah Khamenei. The threat from Iran demands an effective policy response—and our European allies are well-placed to formulate one with us.

You see, even though Iran is an oil exporter, its economy is highly dependent on imported gasoline and other refined petroleum products. We need to embargo this trade. European companies are heavily involved in the Iranian gasoline business. Policymakers need to stop this trade to end this nuclear threat. If the Iranian regime faced damaging economic pressure from a significant reduction in gasoline supplies, it may indeed change its course and an ever-present threat to Israel and to global security may be alleviated.

I think we are all encouraged by the joint statement that came from the G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy, expressing concern over Iran's belligerence. And I hope by the next G8 summit in December, the deadline set by the world leaders—our European allies included, we will see real international collaboration to curb the threats of Tehran.

Nothing endangers peace more than a refusal to face facts. Even as we set deadlines for when discussions with Iran might begin, let's remember that they continue to enrich uranium and that a deadline with real consequences must be considered, along with engagement. Otherwise, engagement will be manipulated as a mere tactic for delay.

I am glad that this House chose to face Iran and support Israel with its vote on Thursday, and I have high hopes that the international community will do the same. We must support and defend our friend Israel and end the nuclear threat of Iran.

WHAT'S IN A NAME? THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to report that 304 of my colleagues in the House, from both parties, have joined me as cosponsors of H.R. 24, legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy to be known as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

I'm grateful to Chairman IKE SKELTON, who included the language of H.R. 24 in the National Defense Authorization Act, which passed the full House last month. This is the eighth year in a row that language to properly recognize the Marine Corps has been included in the House version of the bill. Unfortunately, each year the language has been stripped in the Senate.

This year, I'm grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former Marine, who introduced the same bill in the Senate, S. 504. With his

help, I'm hopeful that this will be the year that the Senate supports the House position and joins in bringing proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, some people might ask, Why is the change so important? Isn't renaming the Department just symbolic? What's in a name?

Well, Madam Speaker, the name of the Marine Corps represents more than two centuries of service alongside the Navy.

What's in a name? The flag raising at Iwo Jima. What's in a name? Scarlet and gold; honor, courage, and commitment; and Semper Paratus. What's in a name? More than 1,000 Marines who have given their lives in serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

As symbolic as a change in the name might be, this is a matter of respect and gratitude to the Marine Corps. The Marines do not serve beneath the Navy. They are one fighting team. That is, the Marine Corps and the Navy as equal partners.

This legislation is not about changing the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Department, reallocating resources, or altering missions. General Carl Mundy, the 30th Commandant of the Marine Corps, summed up the need for this change when he said, "This action will accurately align the Secretary's title with his present-day authority and responsibilities. As is, the title is confusing. It is inconsistent with the status of the four Armed Services in the Department of Defense. And it acknowledges only two-thirds of the uniformed servicemembers in the Department."

Over the course of the Marine Corps' history, including their present-day service around the world, those three words, "and Marine Corps," have been earned through blood and sacrifice.

When the Department of the Navy writes the families of Marines who have been killed, their families deserve to receive the letter from the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, the Marines fighting today deserve this recognition, and those who are part of the history of the Marine Corps deserve that recognition as well.

Madam Speaker, I want to close my comments by first saying to those in Iraq and Afghanistan, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And I ask God in his loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I close three times by asking God, please God; please God; please God, continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE CAPE COD BASEBALL LEAGUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I rise today so that my colleagues in the House of Representatives can join me in recognizing the Cape Cod Baseball League of Massachusetts on its 125th anniversary.

Recognized as "the" summer collegiate league in the Nation, the Cape Cod Baseball League today consists of 10 franchises in two five-team divisions. In its early years, during World War I and World War II, the league was populated largely by young GIs fresh from their service. The modern era of the league began in 1963, when it was officially sanctioned by the NCAA.

Throughout its existence, the League has promoted to the big time—"the bigs"—several Cy Young and Most Valuable Player Award winners, as well as Major Leaguers who achieved Hall of Fame status, as well as decorated scouts and managers, all of whom got their start on the fields of dreams on Cape Cod.

Entering its 125th season, the League continues to offer the most talented baseball players from across the country the opportunity to demonstrate their skills in front of Major League scouts. As the pioneer among the Nation's summer leagues—including, by the way, the use of wooden bats—the Cape Cod Baseball League is truly America's League.

Young players learn the importance of sportsmanship and teamwork not only on the diamond and in the dugout, but also through the generosity of Cape Cod families who open their homes to host these young men during the summer season.

At a time when the integrity of the game is at risk, the Cape Cod Baseball League continues to embody the golden American tradition of wholesome entertainment. Our national pastime has been kept alive in its most pure state, owing to the effort of this volunteer organization, which enables fans to enjoy games at no expense; where visions of striped socks, crackerjacks, and lemonade evoke feelings of nostalgia for the bygone days of America's favorite sport.

The Cape Cod Baseball League stands out as a national treasure that can captivate any spectator through an exciting, competitive, nine-inning baseball game.

On this historic occasion, I am proud to honor the Cape Cod Baseball League for its 125 years of success and for its well-established, beloved reputation among the Cape Cod family, both residents and tourists alike. Congratulations to the players and to the volunteers in that organization, and may you forever be "Where the Stars of Tomorrow Shine Tonight."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING MR. JACK H. JONES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I rise today to honor Mr. Jack H. Jones, who was recently elected Imperial Potentate of Shriners International, which makes him the highest-ranking Shriner in the world.

I want to share with my colleagues, many of whom may be unfamiliar with the work of the Shriners, what they are all about. Shriners International is a fraternity based on fun, fellowship, and the Masonic principles of brotherly love, relief, and truth. There are approximately 375,000 members from the 191 temples, or chapters, in the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Panama.

□ 1745

I am proud to be a Shriner and support their ongoing charitable efforts. Shriners International supports Shriners Hospitals for Children, a one-of-a-kind international health care system of 22 hospitals dedicated to improving the lives of children by providing specialty pediatric care, innovative research and outstanding teaching programs. Since 1922, Shriners Hospitals for Children have significantly improved the lives of more than 865,000 children.

Mr. Jones has been involved with Shriners for more than 30 years. He has served as Imperial Recorder, part of the body that governs the Shriners. Prior to his election to that position, he served on the Elected Divan of Egypt Shriners in Tampa, Florida. His Masonic affiliations include Egypt Shriners, Hillsborough Lodge No. 25 F.&A.M., Tampa York Rite, Tampa Scottish Rite, Red Cross of Constantine, Royal Order of Jesters, and National Sojourners. He also is a 33rd degree Scottish Rite Mason.

Mr. Jones has earned many awards for his service with the Shriners, including the Benjamin Franklin Award for the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, the Henry Prince Medal from the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, and the Andrew Jackson Medal from the Grand Lodge of Tennessee. In 2006, he was presented the Imperial Potentate Award of Merit, which is the highest honor in the Shriners fraternity.

In his new position, the Imperial Potentate will serve as chairman of the Board of Directors for Shriners International and Shriners Hospital for Children. I am certain that his immeasurable talent and experience will greatly help the Shriners and the many people who benefit from their work.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of our colleagues to congratulate Mr.

Jones on his election as Imperial Potentate and recognize the contributions that Shriners worldwide make to the betterment of our world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNEMPLOYMENT, CAP-AND-TAX, AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, after losing an additional 467,000 jobs last month, our Nation's unemployment rate reached a 25-year high of 9.5 percent. It is time for the administration and the Democratic majority to admit what the American people know all too well: the vaunted Democratic stimulus bill has failed to stimulate anything other than a few Federal bureaucrats and the Chinese, who are loaning us, with hefty interest, I might add, those stimulus dollars.

When President Obama and the Democratic leadership rammed the 1,073-page stimulus bill through Congress without giving Representatives on either side of the aisle, much less voters back home, a chance to actually read it, they promised that the \$1 trillion price tag would go to "saving or creating 3.5 million jobs." Well, Madam Speaker, I must ask the question, Where are the jobs?

To make matters worse, the House passed the "Pelosi Global Warming Tax" 2 weeks ago that will only make it harder for businesses and families to survive by piling an additional \$3,000 on to every household's energy bill. This cap-and-tax policy, they call it cap-and-trade, but it is a cap-and-tax policy, would further impose artificial emissions standards on American companies and energy producers, increasing the cost of doing business and forcing them to cede market share to overseas competitors who will not be subject to these limits on carbon dioxide emissions. I repeat: they will not be subject to these limits, and I'm talking, of course, about China and India.

And now the same people who turned General Motors into "Government Motors" have set their sights on a government-controlled health care system that gives power to bureaucrats rather than doctors, like myself, to make decisions about your care. As we have

seen in Great Britain and Canada, the end result would be the virtual elimination of private health insurance and the creation of a one-size-fits-all government health plan that would ration care by limiting the types of treatments patients can receive.

Madam Speaker, instead of another government takeover, we need real solutions which will make health care more affordable and more accessible while leaving critical choices and decisions about their health where they belong, in the hands of patients and their physicians.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009 AND 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 422(a)(2) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revised 302(a) allocations for the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal years 2009 and 2010. Section 422(a)(2) of S. Con. Res. 13 directs the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for certain program integrity initiatives when these initiatives are included in an appropriations bill. The bill H.R. 3170 (Making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes) includes an appropriation for such an initiative in accordance with S. Con. Res. 13. A corresponding table is attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this adjusted allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

Any questions may be directed to Ellen Ballis or Gail Millar.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302 ALLOCATION (In millions of dollars)

	BA	OT
Current allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,088,059	1,306,759
Change for program integrity initiatives: H.R. 3170 (Appropriations for Financial Services and General Government):		
Fiscal Year 2009	0	0
Fiscal Year 2010	600	564
Revised allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,088,659	1,307,323

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THANKS AND FAREWELL TO LIZ BIRNBAUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, in the frenetic pace we maintain in Washington, we too seldom acknowledge the invaluable role played by our staffs. As chairman of the Committee on House Administration, on this occasion I wish to note the recent departure of my invaluable committee staff director, S. Elizabeth Birnbaum.

Since her arrival in 2007, Liz has served the committee, the House and the country with distinction, providing me and my colleagues with wise counsel honed during her years of service with the Department of the Interior; with the House Interior and Natural Resources Committee, as it was then known; as a tireless advocate for the health of our nation's waterways at the environmental organization American Rivers, and elsewhere. In addition to her policy advice, Liz also proved a strong, effective, compassionate leader for the committee staff from whom her colleagues could and should have learned much during her tenure.

Madam Speaker, the House Administration Committee may be the most important committee that many Americans have never heard of. We don't write tax or spending bills, we simply run this place. I can assure the House that the committee could not have run this place for the past two years without Liz Birnbaum. We grapple with dozens of administrative matters every day, large and small, each crucial to someone. Although I cannot be certain, because she has so many from which to choose, I suspect Liz might consider her greatest accomplishment to be her legislative and oversight roles in the December 2008 opening of the Capitol Visitor Center, already toured by nearly 1.5 million people.

Liz will be greatly missed, but we can all take comfort that she will not be far away. The President lured Liz back downtown to the Interior Department, where she will direct the Minerals Management Service implementing the Administration's policies concerning resources on federal lands. While the committee's loss is definitely the President's gain, as Liz herself knows, Capitol Hill never lets go of alumni completely. So, on behalf of my committee, the House, and the country, I thank Liz Birnbaum for her dedicated service, wish her well in her next assignment, and fondly look forward to seeing her again soon.

GENOCIDAL HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, recently the Secretary of State appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and confirmed that it is the administration's goal to include abortion as an integral element of "reproductive health care" provided by

the United States overseas. This hearing came on the heels of the Secretary's words of praise for Margaret Sanger as a personal heroine. Margaret Sanger was a notorious American eugenicist who advocated tirelessly for policies to eliminate persons she deemed inferior and unworthy to live, namely the poor, the immigrant, and the black child.

While the Secretary at the hearing did rightfully deplore the racist comments attributed to Margaret Sanger, the administration's policies regrettably continue to champion abortion both here and abroad. This continues despite the fact that more and more Americans oppose the practice, let alone using taxpayer dollars to fund it, or imposing it on persons across the world who may be weaker and more vulnerable.

Margaret Sanger's world view should shock the conscience and evoke equal condemnation from thoughtful persons on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, for this reason, I was stunned to learn that in a July 12 interview with the New York Times, Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg echoed the sentiments of Sanger. While explaining the outcome of *Harris v. McRae*, a 1980 Supreme Court ruling that upheld the Hyde amendment, which disallows Medicaid funding for abortions, Justice Ginsburg said this, "frankly I had thought that at the time *Roe* was decided, there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

Madam Speaker, did you hear those words? Justice Ginsburg, I repeat, actually said this, "There was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

Madam Speaker, to whom was Justice Ginsburg referring? Who would Justice Ginsburg prefer to not have live? It is unfathomable that in this day and age, a Justice of the United States Supreme Court would articulate such a patently genocidal sentiment.

This is more of the same discredited, amoral philosophy of social engineering that offers no comfort, no vision of the common bond of all humanity, particularly for those who are weak and vulnerable among us.

Madam Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I have to say such things. I know we have come much further than this in our society. Millions of Americans believe that we are big enough and loving enough as a Nation to embrace the mother and her unborn child and truly care for life. We can do better. We must do better. Women deserve better than abortion, and America deserves better from its leaders.

"GOVERNMENT MOTORS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, 2 days after Independence Day, the remaining GM dealers in the United States received a letter from the General Motors National Dealer Council letting the dealers know that the National Dealer Council strongly opposes the Automobile Dealer Economic Rights Restoration Act of 2009. It is also called H.R. 2743. The letter urged all remaining GM dealers to sign the letter immediately, by no later than 5 p.m. on Tuesday, July 7. They urged the dealers to fax it back to the National Dealer Council urging that they do not support passage of the restoration of economic rights.

I have nothing personally against GM or Chrysler, Madam Speaker. These are great American companies. But what I do object to is the Federal Government effectively taking over these once great companies.

Last Friday, GM emerged from bankruptcy, Madam Speaker, but do the American people even realize that they own a majority share in this company, effectively 61 percent, which is why many people now call it "Government Motors"? Do they know that 3,400 privately owned dealerships were given pink slips essentially by the Federal Government? 3,400 dealerships were closed down all across the America, not because these dealers were failing? Hardly. In my district dealers were experiencing some of their best months ever for sales, high customer satisfaction and terrific service.

Perplexed and bewildered, 3,400 automobile dealers across the United States were given pink slips essentially by the Obama Auto Task Force; 150,000 jobs are estimated to be at risk of vanishing by this move. And with these jobs goes a part of the American Dream for private property owners and business in our country. The remaining GM dealers carved up the spoils.

Now let me be perfectly clear. I fault none of these existing remaining GM dealers. These actions weren't their fault. Our fear with government owning these car companies is that politics will control GM's remaining decisions, not business. And now with this letter, it seems that politics is prevailing. Existing dealers are urged by GM to work against restoring economic rights to the dealers who saw their businesses' value drained from them overnight.

How can current GM dealers possibly stand up against GM when GM is the Federal Government? Again, dealers are urged to sign a letter that will disadvantage their disenfranchised former competitors. This is a bad business, Madam Speaker. And it perfectly illustrates why we don't want government to own, operate, or control private businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE NATIONAL ENERGY TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time to come down to the floor and talk about the bill which recently passed the House, the cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax national energy tax bill, which has a basic premise. The basic premise says that there is too much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The solution is to make sure that the emission of carbon dioxide is charged more, and that charge will decrease our reliance on that by forcing people not to use fossil fuels.

It sounds simple. It is not that simple. Fossil fuels is the basic foundational fuel for a thriving economy. And in this economy that we have today, the last thing we want to do is slow that engine by raising costs.

Energy is a component in the cost of everything we do. Here in this Chamber, we appreciate the lights being on. That currently is possible by fossil fuels. Whether that is coal or natural gas, fossil fuels help create that electricity. As we drive back and forth to our districts, the gasoline is a fossil fuel. If we are flying back to our districts, the jet fuel is a fossil fuel. If we add a cost on the use of fossil fuels, the cost for everything increases from the clothes that you wear to the food that you consume and to the houses that you build.

The last time we went through environmental legislation that dealt with the Clean Air Act, there was great devastation of jobs throughout the Midwest. An example is this poster that I bring to the floor numerous times of United Mine Worker members from Peabody No. 10 in Kincaid, Illinois. When the last Clean Air Act amendments were adopted, 1,200 mine workers in this mine alone lost their jobs. There is an effect by the legislation that we pass here on the floor of this House.

□ 1800

And not only did it affect these individual miners, but it affected all the communities from which they have come from because that was the major job creator in this county was those who operated this mine. They not only lost their jobs, but in southern Illinois, 14,000 other mine workers lost their jobs. This is very similar to what happened throughout the rest of the Midwestern States.

The one that really is poignant because the head of the Ohio Coal Association, the Ohio Mining Association came before our committee and said, after the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, 35,000 coal mine workers lost their jobs. And so that's why those of us from coal-producing areas and those of us who want low-cost fuel have come to the floor and we fought so diligently in opposition to the national energy tax.

Now, if we want to move on the national energy tax and if we want to limit the amount of carbon dioxide because the atmosphere has too much, wouldn't it be important to ensure that the rest of the countries that are developing would also comply? But the bill that passed the House had no provision, had no trigger to ensure that the number one emitter of carbon dioxide would have to comply in a regime, and that's China. Another major emitter of carbon dioxide is India. They're not involved and responsible for moving to limit their emissions. So, for the United States to go into and disarm ourselves by raising our energy costs against countries that compete with us because they can pay their employees more, they don't comply with environmental standards, now we are going to allow them to have cheaper energy, it is just a foolish proposition.

So what have Republicans done? We've come to the floor to talk about what really are the energy demands that we have in this country. We need to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. The cap-and-tax bill does nothing to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil.

What we have proposed is making sure that we take access of the Outer Continental Shelf, the oil and gas reserves there. The royalties then are used not to continue to bring additional taxes on the American people. The royalties are used to expand wind and solar power that is now developing throughout this country, which we support because we want a diversified energy portfolio. We want to make sure we use our most efficient, cheapest source that we have, which is coal. We want to use it for electricity generation, driving down electricity prices. We also want to use that to produce liquid fuel, so we have a competitor. That is where we decrease our reliance on imported crude oil.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SECTOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House this afternoon because, like so many Members of this body, I am engaged in a terribly important exercise of working to think through the next generation of regulation that will oversee the stability and health of our financial services sector. This is a terribly important and challenging thing that we do. We need to make sure that we do what is necessary to have a vibrant, innovative, thriving financial services sector that employs the people of Connecticut and the people of this Nation, that pays taxes in Connecticut and to this Nation, but that we toe the line in such a way that we never find ourselves in the position that we are in today of tens and hundreds of billions

of taxpayer dollars being brought to the table to bail out a private industry that took too many risks.

And I rise this evening because I am concerned by the conclusion being drawn by some of the Members of this House, because our regulatory apparatus which, let's face it, was crafted in the 1930s, failed in many respects. And, boy, did it fail in some spectacular aspects. The conclusion seems to be drawn that government cannot regulate, that we should get out of the business, that we should leave the financial services sector entirely to its own devices, that somehow individual responsibility alone will create a stable and vibrant financial services sector.

And so I want to hearken back to the history of this body and this government crafting smart regulation. Think back 110, 120 years ago. American families ate rotten food. They bought snake oil in the guise of pharmaceuticals. They worked in factories that burned down and killed hundreds. They lived in cities that were unsanitary.

And over 120 years, 110 years, maybe starting with the fine Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, this Nation said we can do better. We can put in place smart regulation that protects our citizens and that adds to the quality of life of every American family. And, in fact, that is what happened, and we haven't gotten it quite right. There have been spectacular failures. But over that 120 years, the efforts of this government to craft smart, efficient regulation hasn't destroyed the economy.

The economic growth in this country over that period of time has been nothing short of spectacular. But it has protected American families. Very few families anymore buy snake oil, buy securities that would put Madoff's securities to shame, find themselves working in factories that burn down and nobody gets out because the doors are locked. 110 years, 120 years of success, not unadulterated success. There have been failures. But over time, the efforts of this country to put in place smart and efficient regulation have helped this economy and have helped the quality of life of American families.

And that is what we must do. We must not shrink from the task just because the SEC blew it on the Madoff case or because other regulators weren't watching new and dangerous markets closely enough. We must not shrink from the task of thinking through what new round of financial regulation allows that industry to thrive, allows that industry to provide credit to American families, to small businesses, to allow our economy to grow, but which never, ever puts us in the kind of risky position that we're working so hard to dig ourselves out of right now.

We can do this. There's a century-long tradition of our working constructively in that direction. So I know we can do this. The answer is smart, efficient, modern regulation for the ben-

efit of everyone and the benefit of this economy.

THE MAJORITY MAKERS AND HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor for me to be here tonight to lead a discussion about the most pressing and the most significant problem to most Americans, and that is the question of health care. I'm here with Members of the class of 2006. We call ourselves the Majority Makers, and from time to time we are here to address matters of great national import with you. But this is a very special topic for the class of 2006.

I remember very well when I began my campaign for Congress back then, in 2006, when many of the headlines of our Nation's newspapers and our television news operations were all about the Iraq war, and people would say to me, Well, I guess everyone's talking about the Iraq war to you. And I said, No, nobody's talking about the Iraq war. It's health care, health care, health care. Everywhere I went, neighborhood picnics, Catholic picnics on Friday night, festivals, businesses, schools, wherever I went, I heard story after story about how Americans were fed up with the health care system that was not serving them. In fact, it was, in many cases, killing them.

Well, here we are, 3 years later, and while health care may not have been on the front pages of the newspapers up till now because we have a severe economic decline and many challenges we're dealing with, this Congress is ready to put health care back on the front pages. And President Obama has already indicated that this is his top priority in his first time in office, and the reasons that that is so are not hard to determine.

It's pretty easy to look around us, look at the numbers and see why we have to take significant, decisive action to improve, to change our health care system. Just a few weeks ago, Dr. Christine Rohmer, who heads the White House's economic team, testified before the House Budget Committee that if we don't make significant steps to reform health care, to get a handle on cost, to bring prices down, that health care, which now comprises 17 percent of our economy, by 2040, would make up 35 percent of our economy.

Well, you don't have to be an economist or a health care expert to know that if health care takes up 35 percent of our economy, it's going to squeeze out most of everything else. In short, it is an unsustainable number. And we can go on and talk about the dramatic impact of Medicare and those types of expenses on the Federal budget as well as on the general economy.

But what most people are concerned about is not the big picture, not the macroeconomic picture; it's the kitchen table picture. It's what happens in your household, what happens to individuals, those people that we meet in all segments of our society from one coast to the other who have had significant difficulties with their health care system. They're small business people who have seen their premiums rise 15, 20, 25 percent every year in spite of the fact that they have very low utilization, healthy people.

We've seen story after story of individuals who, at 55 years of age, lose their job. They can't get COBRA for a very long period of time. They don't qualify for Medicare. They try to go out in the private market and buy insurance, but at 55, most everybody's going to have some kind of preexisting condition that makes them, under current, the current system, uninsurable.

We heard from a couple yesterday in that exact same position. They came to testify to Congress. A woman has had epilepsy since she was 5 years old. Her husband lost his job. Now they go out and try to shop for insurance in the private market, but because she has epilepsy, something totally beyond her control, obviously, the only insurance policy she could get cost \$2,600 a month. Now, how many people in this country can afford \$2,600 a month for health insurance? \$30,000 a year. Well, not very many. But these are stories that are repeated time after time after time.

I have to tell one that was a personal experience of mine, and then I'm going to let my colleagues from the class of 2006 contribute not just their stories about where health care needs to be fixed, but also what this Congress is proposing to do to set America on a sounder course for health care.

Back during my 2006 campaign, we had a young worker, a young woman in her mid-twenties, was a volunteer in our campaign. She was severely disabled, so severely disabled she was wheelchair-bound. And she told me that if she were not covered by SSI, she would have spent, had to spend \$3,000 a month just on her prescription medications, but because of SSI, she was able to manage her health care problems.

Now, she had, and I hope she still has, a boyfriend, and they wanted to get married. Her boyfriend worked at a supermarket company. He was making \$11 an hour, which, to them, was a great salary. But they couldn't get married, because if they got married, she would lose her disability coverage, and the company where her boyfriend was employed could not, would not put her on the policy because she was so expensive to cover.

□ 1815

So what we have here are two people in love, wanting to get married, wanting to start a family, wanting to do what so many Americans want to do, and because of a health care coverage

issue, they cannot get married. In this country, there is no excuse for that situation.

Time after time, all of us run into situations in which people are having to make important life decisions based on whether there is the availability of health care coverage. There is someone who wants to leave a company and wants to start a small business of his own—not able to do it because of coverage. There is somebody who wants to leave a situation, in which he or she has coverage, in order to go back to school to further his education and advance his prospects—can't do it because of insurance coverage. We all know these scenarios all too well.

So this Congress and this President have set out to change the health care system in this country to make sure that every American has peace of mind and security where his or her health care is concerned. That's what we're about, and that's why we're going to put health care back on the front pages and back as the lead story on America's newscasts over the next few weeks, because we are going to do for the American people what we know they want us to do and need us to do.

With that, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank my colleague from Kentucky for organizing this very important discussion today.

We have got some terrific Members who have been very engaged in this health care topic for a long time, and I say "a long time" because, even though these are folks who came to this Chamber in January of 2007, all of them are people who have been working on this issue for many, many years. So this is going to be an important discussion tonight, I think a stimulating one, and one that will be enlightening to all of those folks who are very concerned about where we are right now.

Today was an incredible day because today there was introduced in this Chamber the Health Reform Act, which, I think, is going to form the basis of moving us forward in a very meaningful and significant way in this country. This has been a long time in coming, this day. We ran on this issue in 2006, not because we made it up out of thin air but because everywhere we went we heard from constituents and members of the public who were saying this was their number one issue. We ran on it again in 2008 because this was the number one issue that people brought to our attention and because of the stories like the one that JOHN YARMUTH just told. There are legions of those stories that we've heard.

I mentioned that this was the number one issue in '06 and '08 for a specific reason, and that is that there are some on the other side and there are even some in the public who are saying we're moving too fast on this—slow down—that we need to take more time to deliberate. It's a fair point but only

to a point, because the people who we were elected by and the people from whom we hear every weekend when we go home to our districts have been clamoring for this kind of reform for decades, and they really can't wait to change the situations they're in right now. So this is a great day because, after decades of struggle and after the past few years when the call for this kind of change has reached a fever pitch, we are at this moment finally at the point where we are putting legislation on the table that is going to make a difference.

I want to yield soon to my colleagues who are here, but let me just mention a couple of things and dispense with some myths.

You know, before we began this exchange, I heard a few folks who were critical of the proposal saying we don't need a government takeover. Well, this bill couldn't be further from a government takeover. What this is doing in a very American way is offering more choices out there. Too many Americans feel that they have been shackled by a private health insurance industry that was more interested in seizing profits for themselves than in really providing high-quality and accessible care to most Americans. Folks are fed up with that. So we're not talking about a government takeover. We're talking about trying to get out from under the takeover that the private health insurance industry has had for so many years. That's what this is about.

The second thing is that this bill invests in primary care and in preventative care. It does the kind of common-sense things that the American people have been calling for for so many years with respect to their health care coverage. Let's treat people on the front end, and keep them from getting sick in the first place rather than waiting for them to get sick on the back end. That makes common sense. The other thing is it invests in our health workforce. If we are going to presume, as we should, to cover everyone in this country and to provide them with health care coverage, we have got to make sure that there are enough caregivers to deliver that care to them.

Let me close with this observation, which is what, I think, most Americans are thinking to themselves. They're thinking: If America could have accomplished all of the things that we've managed to accomplish over the last few decades, even as we were carrying this broken health care system around on our backs, imagine what we could accomplish as a society, as individuals, if we could fix this health care system. Imagine if your mother, who goes to work, who leaves a child at home who has got a fever of 100 degrees, but you don't have to worry because you know that your family has decent health care coverage. Imagine how much more productive you're going to be at work that day. Imagine you're a small business that wants to do the right thing

for your employees, but you could never afford to do it, but now you can. Imagine if you're a large business that's trying to compete with a competitor overseas that has more of a shared obligation from the public and private sectors to help it with the cost of health care. Imagine how much more productive and competitive you could be.

So, given that America has been as successful as we've been all of these years, even with this monkey we've been carrying around on our back, just think of and just imagine the heights we're going to reach as a Nation and as individuals if we can fix this health care system. That's what this bill is all about.

So I want to thank you, JOHN, my colleague from Kentucky, for convening us today to talk about this very, very important issue. Let me yield my time back to you.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

He raises a point that, I think, is appropriate to make at this time. We will hear a lot over these few weeks as we're going to be actively engaged in this issue of trying to bring a bill to the floor and of passing it before August 1. You will hear a lot about the Canadian system, and you will hear a lot of fear tactics being thrown at the debate because, right now, those people who are opposing what we are trying to do really have nothing but fear tactics to throw at it.

It's interesting, because we had a hearing in Ways and Means several weeks ago. A gentleman was there who was arguing against our public option, the public option part of the proposal, which basically is a government-run plan that would compete with private insurers and that would compete for your business, for the business of the American people. He kept saying, We don't want Canada. We don't want Canada. We don't want Canada with the long lines and all of these things—all of these myths that have arisen around the Canadian system.

I asked him if he knew how many countries in the world, how many industrialized nations, had a nationalized health insurance system. He said all of them except the United States. How many have universal coverage? All of them except the United States. How many have a blend of public and private where you have a basic level of coverage provided by the government but where people can buy private insurance to enhance their positions? He said, Well, all of them except Canada. I said, So you have chosen the one country in the world that is an outlier. He used that to undermine the arguments for an American plan when we haven't copied anything from Canada in this country, that I know of, except hockey. He really didn't have a response to that.

The point is you will hear a lot of these myths thrown out, and they really don't relate to what we're doing or

are trying to do, which is to create a uniquely American solution to a uniquely American problem.

With that, I would like to yield time to my colleague from Massachusetts, Congresswoman NIKI TSONGAS.

Ms. TSONGAS. I want to thank my colleague from Kentucky.

It is an historic day, I think, to be here, discussing the issue of health care. You were talking about how many in our class campaigned on the very important issue of health care. I came in at midterm—a year, maybe 10 months after you all had been elected—as part of a special election process in which the issue of expanding coverage for children under the Children's Health Insurance Program was the defining issue. I ran on a campaign, as many in my class did, to expand children's health coverage. Finally, we have been successful this year with President Obama's signing that most important legislation into law.

I also happened to be running at a time when the new Massachusetts system, which was designed to provide guaranteed access to affordable health care for Massachusetts residents, was coming into play. We had many, many questions around the potential it would have, around the difficulties it might present and around the costs it might impose. In fact, since we began that most important system, 439,000 residents of our State are now covered with quality, affordable health care.

This legislation created a mechanism not unlike the exchange that we are talking about in the legislation that was being proposed today, which creates a place for people to go to assess the different possibilities of health care and to make sensible choices that make sense for them.

What I learned from the Massachusetts experiment, which has become very successful, is that, while we talk very much about what the role of government is, in Massachusetts, the role of government was to be the architect of the system that brought everybody to the table—the employer, the individual and government—to sort out how best each player should play its role. Because we had that cooperative approach, which is what, I think, we see in the legislation that has come to the table today and the successes that that has generated, I think it is a remarkable model that says there is a role for government but that everybody has to play its most important part.

So I think this is, really, a very exciting day for our country. It is the beginning of a process. I look forward to reaching out to my constituents, who will have slightly different perspectives because of their experiences under the Massachusetts model, and to getting their input as we go forward with the most important debate that we are just beginning. I thank you for beginning that today.

I apologize for not staying longer, but the women of the House are play-

ing a softball game later this evening, and I don't want to be too late, even though I'm only going to be cheering, because I don't want to end up in the hospital, in need of care, as a result of my poor game-playing talents. So thank you for beginning this most important discussion.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentlelady, and I intend to be at the game myself in a most supportive role.

I would like now to introduce one of the physicians of the House. Not too long ago, there was an article in the New York Times that talked about the number of physicians here. They make an extraordinary contribution to our efforts in this field and in many others.

So it gives me great pleasure to yield to my good friend from Wisconsin, Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Congressman YARMUTH. I appreciate the opportunity to join with you and with other Members of the class of 2006, the difference-makers, the Majority Makers, who brought a message of positive change here to Washington in January of 2007. What happened is we had another election in 2008, and we returned because we haven't finished the job yet.

There is an inheritance that our President, Barack Obama, has taken on. I can't think of another time in American history when a President inherited so much in crisis: the housing crisis, where housing construction and prices were falling through the floor, and a financial crisis where the credit markets completely froze up and went into a medical coma—money wasn't being transferred between banks. He inherited a lot. He also inherited 3.7 million people who had lost their jobs during the previous year.

□ 1830

This economic recession that we've slipped into began under the watch of the previous President, and we have a lot of fixing to do. It's going to need a doctor in the House to get things going. But we do have hope now because we have a new way of looking at things. We're taking a positive approach, and we brought forward today a bill that begins the process of healing our fractured health care system.

Now when I ran for Congress and when I got re-elected, I put together a health care advisory team in my district, in northeast Wisconsin, composed of physicians, of medical people involved in hospital administration, insurance people, nurses, everybody that's involved in health care, and we came up with 10 essential elements that should be included in a successful piece of Federal legislation. The first and most important element was no discrimination. We sought to apply our constitutional rights that protect us against discrimination to the health care industry to guarantee that no one would suffer from discrimination, not on the basis of the color of their skin but the chemistry of their skin or, in

the case that you mentioned, the patient with epilepsy. We shall not discriminate against any citizen or legal resident based upon pre-existing medical conditions, and that's in this bill that was submitted today for our consideration.

Now the bill may not be perfect. It certainly hasn't been read all the way through yet. It's only 1,018 pages. But it does have within it, "No discrimination against any citizen or legal resident due to pre-existing medical conditions."

The second most essential element of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin's ideas was that we needed a standard plan, a health care benefit plan that was standardized such that each and every insurance company would offer in the marketplace, by openly disclosing the price, a standard plan. That's in this bill. The idea is to create competition, which doesn't exist today, create open and transparent markets that don't exist today because you can't call up an insurance company and ask for the price. They just don't know what to charge you until they find out how to cherry-pick you out or boost up your price. So no discrimination and a standard plan are in this bill. When we do that, when we have an open marketplace with a standard policy that's being sold in a very competitive fashion, I believe we can drive down the price of your insurance premiums by about 22 percent. That's a lot of money when the average cost today is \$1,200 to \$1,400 a month for a family of four.

The third element, transparency. It's in the bill. The fourth element, incentives, financial incentives to begin to root out waste in the system. I believe, as many people here in Congress and across the country believe, that we're spending enough money across this country now on health care. It just needs to find a better home. Since 47 percent is the overall overhead of the private insurance industry for small business, that means that when a small business sends a dollar in to an insurance company, 47 cents, in my view, is wasted. It's wasted on the bureaucracy within that insurance industry. We can and must do better. We must drive that overhead down to 15 percent; and when we do, we'll save America \$39 billion a year which will go right back into our economy. I am absolutely convinced, as are many Members here, that when we reduce the cost of health care for everyone by using the marketplace to leverage things down, leverage the price down, we're going to stimulate our economy because there are two big overheads right now for any small business. It's called health care and energy. If you're in farming, if you are a small business on Main Street or the side streets, you've got an overhead that's health care, number one, and energy, number two. So I'm very pleased to see that these essential elements are in this bill. It's a great day for America. It's a very hopeful day.

I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank Dr. KAGEN for his expert contribution. As we move forward, we will rely more and more on those people who have been in the trenches. And for someone who has been in the trenches and knows the problems that face his patients and his colleagues in the medical profession, we will be able to craft a much better piece of legislation. So I thank him for his contribution tonight.

Now it gives me great pleasure to introduce another individual who has been focused on health care throughout his political career, a good friend from Memphis, Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky bringing up this topic and joining Dr. KAGEN, my colleague; Mr. SARBANES and Ms. TSONGAS, who was with us, in discussion.

I look at the inscription that is over the Speaker's chair here in the United States Capitol, and it's Daniel Webster. Daniel Webster says, "Let us bring the resources of our Nation, our institutions together," and may we do something here that is worth remembering and something worthwhile that may be remembered. I can't think of anything that would be more worthwhile to Daniel Webster's spirit than we could do to have people remember this 111th Congress and to provide the health care that's been sought for so many generations.

I think back to Harry Truman who really had this original concept and wanted to see national health care. You think about what Mr. YARMUTH talked about, the only industrialized nation on the Earth that does not have health care for its people. It is the greatest country on the face of the Earth, but we don't provide health care, and that's somehow an omission that this country has glaringly overlooked. Dr. King would certainly be in favor of such a bill because this is a Nation that has forgotten so many for so long, and we cannot continue to do that and be considered the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

This bill that President Obama talked about today, and has gotten through the committees with Mr. MILLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN and Speaker PELOSI, who have worked so hard on it—and there is a comparable bill in the Senate—will see to it that we save money, \$500 billion over the next 10 years in Medicare, securing for our seniors a Medicare system that will be affordable and available and offer quality care. It will see to it that we ferret out fraud and waste from the system and make savings that will help reduce our deficit that we're presently experiencing. So there is a fiscal mechanism to this bill as well. It will see that pre-existing conditions cannot be used, as Mr. YARMUTH's couple was used as an example, to deprive people of health care insurance. There is a lot of profit in the system now with advertisements on television, profits for in-

surance companies and tremendous salaries and profits that are there; and they need to be wrung out of the system. One way we're going to do it is by having this public option plan compete and force insurance companies, if they intend to remain active in the market, to compete with a national system that does not have those same costs and will keep costs down. This will be more quality at a cheaper cost and more people covered. You know, there is a tax that we already have in America. When you have 47 million people—maybe 50 million at this point—without health insurance and 14,000 more people each month who lose their health insurance, when those people get sick, they still get care someplace, sometime, but it's paid for by higher insurance premiums, it's paid for by higher taxes. Where there are community hospitals, they go to emergency rooms. You pay for it—the most expensive care possible in an emergency room which wouldn't be there if the people had insurance because they could go to their doctors—and it's paid for through property taxes by citizens in an expensive manner. This will be eliminated. So for all those cities, including mine, where we have The MED, a community hospital, a trauma center that treats a lot of people that don't have insurance at an expensive rate in the emergency room, those people will have insurance, and they won't be coming to the emergency room, and it won't cost our taxpayers as much which means that that trauma center will be available for trauma care, as it was intended. In case there is a disaster, it will be available as well and that trauma center can survive. There won't be this tax that's put on everybody for taking care of the uninsured in uncompensated care, which hospitals do, and just charge it to you in a higher bill that you get from your physician or from your health care provider. We're paying for it but without any controls. So the system is really out of control. It needs to be restrained.

Now Mr. YARMUTH talked about Canada. And I know that we probably don't want to compare anything we're doing here—except for hockey—to Canada. But I was with a Canadian minister yesterday in Memphis—not a minister in the clerical sense but a government official; and he told me that a lot of people compare our system to yours, he said, "You know, our people live to an average of 81 years of age, and your people live to 78." He said, "The increase in inflation in our health care is 1 percent a year, and in your system it's 10 percent a year." He mentioned some other figures, and this was his perspective. He said, "I wouldn't trade our system for yours for anything." Our system is the most expensive health care on the face of the Earth, but it's not the best. And we're paying for it. And that's wrong. Not enough people get health care. I'm happy to be a part of this Congress, to support this

bill with a strong public plan that will see to it that we can compete with the insurance industry to keep their costs down and to see that everybody has access to health care as this plan will.

I would like to yield to my Wisconsin namesake STEVE and, as my father was a doctor, a fine doctor, Mr. KAGEN from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Mr. COHEN. I want to thank you for your kind words about what we're about to do together. But let's agree—we're not Canada. We're going to have a uniquely American health care solution. I don't think anybody in this body, I don't think any one legislator here, I don't think any one watching tonight or across America would argue, we're getting a menu. Now my son works at a pizzeria, and he's a pretty darn good cook. This is Appleton's First & Finest Pizzeria, Frank's Pizza Place. Now if we all go there together and we order a sausage 12-inch medium pizza, it's \$12.50. It says it right here. Now if you order that same pizza, what are you going to pay? \$12.50. Health care shouldn't be much more complicated than that. The price is openly disclosed at the pizzeria, and they don't discriminate against anybody. They are happy to take any customer on. And just like in health care, they're only as good as their last performance. So they have to compete for business. They compete with the Italian place down the street or the Greek restaurant or the Chinese restaurant or just your home cooking. So what we're suggesting here is that we use the leverage of the marketplace, that we have an open, transparent and competitive medical marketplace and guarantee universal access as we will do. The power of no discrimination, the power of equality, it is, after all, the foundation of our country and our culture. It is equality that we seek, not of outcomes, but equality of opportunity. I think it's time to apply that "no discrimination" theme not just to the insurance world saying, No, you can't cherry-pick and discriminate against someone because of a pre-existing condition. It's time to take our equality, our desire for equality and no discrimination to the level of the pharmacy counter. As a doctor, I can tell you, that is where the rubber meets the road. If I write a prescription for a patient, and they can't fill it because they can't afford it, if it's not on their list, we haven't done a thing. We haven't improved that patient's health. So we have to make certain that when you go to the pharmacy counter, you're going to pay the openly disclosed lowest price that they accept as payment in full from anybody.

I'll use just one other example, and then I will yield back. Our veterans. Everywhere I go in Wisconsin, we subscribe, we volunteer; but our veterans didn't go into combat and didn't serve our country for themselves. They serve for our entire Nation. They didn't serve just for themselves; and yet they're the ones that have the VA benefit of that

discount for their prescription drug. I think it's time that the soldier's wife or husband had that same benefit of that low-cost prescription drug and their children. And while we're at it, what about their next-door neighbor? What about their community? What about the whole country? If we could use the power, the purchasing power of these United States together in leveraging down prices for everybody, we could have affordable prescription drugs once again. That would bring equality to the pharmacy counter. It's something that needs to be defined very clearly in this piece of legislation. It isn't there yet, but we're going to work together and hopefully get that done.

Mr. COHEN. I would like to ask you two questions before we yield to another Member who wants to participate. What's going to happen with the doughnut hole? The seniors are very concerned about the doughnut hole. Will we be working on that?

Mr. KAGEN. The answer is, yes, we can, and yes, we will. By working together, we can close the doughnut hole; but it's going to take the opportunity and the power and the legality of leveraging down the price by using the government purchasing power. When we, the people, band together in a purchasing pool to leverage down the prices for prescription drugs, we can get that price down. And I will give you one further hypothetical. If you are the owner of a drug company selling a pill in Mexico City for \$1, thank you for openly disclosing that product and that price. That is the price it should be in New York State all the way through to California and the territories. Show me your price, and give every citizen and legal resident that same lowest price that you accept as payment in full. That's the power of the marketplace, and that is equality brought to the pharmacy.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Dr. KAGEN. Before I yield back to Mr. YARMUTH, I would just like to ask him a question.

If you have an insurance policy now that you like, can you keep it?

Mr. YARMUTH. Oh, absolutely. I think that's the uniquely American element of this plan that is most important to stress. No one is forced to do anything in this plan. If you like your coverage, if you have employer-sponsored insurance that you're happy with, you get to keep it. No change is necessary, no change is mandated. You get to keep your choice of doctors. You get to choose your hospital. These are the fundamental elements that we considered extremely critical to this legislation because we know many Americans are satisfied with their health coverage, and we don't want to change their situation.

□ 1845

We want to make sure that everyone is satisfied with their coverage, that everyone has coverage; and through the competitive American spirit, that

we think we are building, creating this legislation, that we will be able to provide the type of environment where people who like what they have can keep it, people who don't like what they have can shop for something that better suits their family's needs; and that's what the entire purpose of this great legislation is.

Mr. COHEN. And if you keep it, you are probably going to get it cheaper because where the uninsured will be insured, and you won't be paying for them through that hidden tax.

Mr. YARMUTH. Well, I think that's the most essential part of this legislation. If we can't control costs in the health care system, if we can't see to it that people get what they need at a lower price, then we know, for instance, that if we don't have reform, it's projected that the average family's cost will increase \$1,800 per year for the foreseeable future. That's unsustainable. We know that.

So cost control through competition is the critical—and through changes we hope that we can incentivize in the way medicine is delivered, health care is delivered and practiced in this country, that we can make affordable, quality health care available to every American.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. YARMUTH. And, you know, this is supposed to be a conversation of the Class of 2006, but occasionally we adopt Members from other classes because we know that they share the values that brought us to Congress.

And it's now my great pleasure to introduce one of those colleagues, Mr. RYAN from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

And just as all of you do feel, this is such a critical issue for our country. And we started coming to the floor in 2002, Congressman MEEK from Florida and I with the 30-something hour, and we were talking about at that point Social Security privatization and just a reminder of what the world would look like today if we would have privatized social security and if Democrats weren't here to prevent that from happening, where we would be now.

But with what's going on, my district is in Akron and Youngstown, Ohio, northeast quadrant. Very industrial. Just a bit north from my friend in Kentucky.

And when you look at what the problems that communities and families are having to deal with there—an example of steel companies that have closed, people, their pensions have gone to the PBGC, some lost their pensions altogether, some lost their health care altogether. Now we are dealing with, as the new GM moves forward, a lot of the old Delphi folks weren't included in the new deal. So now they're left on the outside whether they're union workers or salary workers that had put just as much time, effort, and intellect into developing Delphi and General Motors over the course of the

years and now finding themselves left behind with a \$14,000 or \$15,000 health care bill.

So what we are talking about here—why you're coming to the floor, why I'm coming to the floor, why President Obama is so forceful in persuading the American people that this has to happen now, why Speaker PELOSI and Senator REID are all on this issue is because this is an issue that the American people want. They know that they are paying too much for their health care. They've experienced the fear of having a pre-existing condition and trying to go out into the market and trying to get somebody to cover them. They deal with this every day.

So I don't want to get too much into the weeds because I think over the course of this next 3 weeks as you come down here and the 30-somethings comes down here and we all get ratcheted up and we all lean on the doctor here to tell us, you know, how this works once it hits the ground, but I think it's important to know that some of the principles here are that no one—once you get your health care—that with these new plans that you will be able to get into—your health care situation will not bankrupt your family; your health care system or your health care plan will not bankrupt your business. You will have coverage. You will have some place to go.

Now, that to me doesn't seem like too big of an "ask" in America today with all of the money that is in this system. And I think that's the beauty, looking at the draft plan and knowing it has to go into all of the different committees and get worked through, I think the magic of what's happening here is that a lot of the costs are going to be squeezed out of the current system that has been inflicted because everyone gets their little piece of the action. And we are saying we squeeze it and reinvest that money.

And in many ways we look—we have some kind of universal coverage now, but it's through the emergency rooms. That's no way to administer health care, Doc. No way to do it. It's more expensive.

So what we're saying is with the preventative proposals that are in here is that there's no cost share to go check-up; there's no cost share to participate in any kind of the preventative measures that a specific plan may have that's going to make you healthier, that's going to make sure that you get a prescription instead of end up in the emergency room a week later and cost the whole system \$100,000 when it could have been taken care of for a \$20 prescription. That's what we're talking about here.

And I'm sure there are going to be a lot of TV ads.

I will be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. KAGEN. So if I understand you correctly, you're saying if you're a citizen, you're going to be in. If it's in your body, you're going to be covered.

And would you also agree that much like we had a systemic financial risk

with our financial meltdown, isn't it also true with the crisis in health care, with the impossible costs for everyone, it presents a systemic risk to our economy and if we do not confront it, our economy may be in shambles?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. There is no question about it, and our economy is in shambles now in part because of the burden that's placed on a lot of the businesses.

I remember about a year ago I was in a roomful of about 15 or 20 businesses, primarily manufacturing businesses in northeast Ohio, 50, 100, 200 people; and we were talking about health care, and they were all talking about how their health care costs went up 15, 20, 30 percent depending on the situation of the people that worked at the factory. And when asked if they would somehow be willing to pay more and get health care off their books completely, would they be willing to do that, they were all like, Sign me up right now. You mean I don't have to deal with this anymore? I can focus on making this product that I make?

And part of what we're trying to do here is to say get all of this waste out of the system, put it on the front end where we can have prevention. Let's stop all of this stupidity of saying you don't get any health care because of whatever reason and you end up with the emergency room costs. Put it up front. Let's squeeze the fat. Let's bring in PhRMA and take some of the savings from there and help fill that donut hole the gentleman from Tennessee was talking about earlier, and let's get ourselves healthy.

And I yield back to my friend.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman for his very important contribution.

And someone else who's been very much engaged in the development of the legislation that was introduced today, the gentleman from Connecticut, who's a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I yield to Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. YARMUTH. So good to see my friend, TIM RYAN, back wearing a path in a familiar spot on the House floor speaking truth to the American people.

Listen, what you are talking about is this invisible cost, Mr. RYAN, to the health care system that we kind of pretend doesn't exist. We didn't get to 17 percent of our gross domestic product by accident. We did that by ignoring some fundamental problems in our health care system. And the fact is that we kind of just, you know, boxed our ears and shut our eyes and tried to sort of wish this problem away.

Well, you know, every employee has started to feel this crunch, right? The percentage of their income that is devoted to health care has inched up and inched up every single year. But a lot of the costs they don't see because employers out there are eating it and are paying these 10 or 12 or 15 percent in-

creases in health care premiums that they're getting every year; and instead of passing the cost of that in its entirety over to the employee, they just don't give as big a wage increase as they might have that year, or maybe they don't give any wage increase. Maybe they actually furlough folks 1 day a month.

These health care costs that companies are taking on are causing wages to remain flat. That's what we've seen over the last 10 years. The GDP in this country is growing. I mean, we're making more stuff if you look at the 10-year window. Obviously in the last 2 years that has not been the case. But in the last 10 years, GDP is growing, but wages are staying right here. There are a lot of reasons for that. Some people up at the real high end of the income spectrum are pretty fat and happy, but a lot of that is because all of the extra money that companies are making is going to pay health care rather than going to their employees.

So that's one way in which the costs of our health care system are sometimes invisible, because employees just assume that they don't get wage increases because their company didn't make as many widgets that year or didn't sell as many pieces of product line. No. A lot of the reason is that they sold more this year; they just took all of that extra profit and paid for health care.

The second thing is what you guys, I'm sure, have been talking about already. It's that we've got a system of universal health care in this country. It's just the worst, most backwards, most inhumane, most inefficient, most unconscionable system of universal health care system in the world because we basically say to people, We will guarantee you health care—our Federal law guarantees you health care but only when you get so disastrously sick that you show up to the emergency room.

A woman in Connecticut came and testified before one of our State legislative committees, and she told a real simple story. And I've told it on the floor before. Had a pain in her foot. Had no insurance. Worked for a living. Did everything she was supposed to. Just didn't have insurance. She knew that she had some sort of infection so she knew what she was going to have to pay for it. She was going to have to go to the doctor, she was going to have to pay probably \$100 for that visit, and she was going to get an antibiotic or she was going to get some medication to make it go away. That was going to be a couple hundred more dollars. She didn't have it. She knew she didn't have it. So she decided to just live with the pain.

Well, finally, one night it was just unbearable. She had to go to the emergency room. So she showed up to the emergency room, and it was too late. That foot was infected so badly it had to be amputated. And that's a terrible, terrible outcome for that woman.

Changes her life for the rest of her time. But it cost the system the thousands of dollars that that surgery and all of that follow-up care required versus the couple hundred bucks we could have gotten in preventative care up front.

We're paying for that. You don't see it because you never met that woman and you never see the thousands like her who end up showing up in the emergency room with crisis care that could have been prevented. That's more invisible costs, but it's all there.

One last point, Mr. RYAN and Mr. YARMUTH.

People are going to hear the cost of these bills when they come out. They're going to see that the cost of the bill from the House is X billion dollars; the cost of the bill of the Senate is X-plus-Y billion dollars. Here's what you have to do. You have to look at that cost versus the cost of doing nothing. And every credible survey, every credible examination is going to tell you this: that the cost of the bill that we produce is going to be half of the cost of sitting and accepting the status quo. That's why we have to pass health care reform here.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman because he talked so much about the higher level of care at the emergency room, most of which is uncompensated for those providers and are shifted to the private-pay customers. I know there are estimates out there that indicate that there is somewhere around a hundred billion dollars a year that's actually care administered in the emergency rooms to people by hospitals who do it as part of charity work, but it's all being shifted to the people who are covered.

So when we talk about a health reform plan that's going to cost roughly \$100 billion a year for 10 years, we're already spending that \$100 billion. So it's not money new to the system, which is, I think in the example of we have plenty of money spent in this country on health care right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just for an example for Medicare Advantage. Fourteen percent overpayment on average for Medicare Advantage, that is over what Medicare pays. That is wasting the taxpayers' dollars. That's the money we're talking about that we can shift from that current program into what Mr. MURPHY was talking about earlier, these kinds of cost savings that we need.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. I'm glad you brought this subject up because not every Medicare Advantage plan is identical, and not every community is identical as well. And there are some areas of the country where Medicare Advantage plans, like in some regions of New York State and some regions of Wis-

consin, are very advantageous. They have a lot of prevention planned in them, and they're not really overcharging at all. They're really bringing about all of the evolution in our health care system that you'd like to see, squeezing out the waste and an emphasis on prevention and primary care.

But no legislation is perfect. And nothing that we codify in law here that the President will sign will instill better judgment in every patient that is going to exist. It still comes down to personal responsibility. We can't possibly instill all of the good judgment into our children, don't you know.

□ 1900

So we have to have an understanding of what our limitations are in terms of government. We have to set up the table and set up the rules of engagement wherein we can have an open and transparent medical marketplace, allow the marketplace to do what it does best, bring down prices for everybody and increase access. But it begins with this piece of legislation that we had submitted today, with no discrimination against anyone to preexisting conditions and a standard plan, a plan that guarantees if you get sick you will be in your house, not the poorhouse.

Mr. COHEN. I was thinking of an old saying, and you might know where it comes from. You know, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and what was the origin of that? Does that not apply to the idea of having wellness programs?

Mr. KAGEN. I thought it was my grandmother.

Mr. COHEN. And I thought it was, too. But doesn't that apply to this program where we have wellness programs now, and if you can pay for wellness programs and preventative care, you don't have to pay for that emergency room care? It's as simple as a traditional slogan like that, a saying comes from Saturday Evening Post or wherever, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound, and that's where we're going to save a lot of money.

Mr. KAGEN. The other thing, the idea that was commonplace up until this point in time is to divide and conquer, and that's what the insurance industry did. They cherry-picked and they separated neighbor from neighbor based on preexisting condition. They went so far as to separate a husband and a wife based on medical conditions, in some cases a mother from her child.

We're going to have to go back to community, the community-based ratings. We're going to have to go back to community here in Congress where we reach across the aisle and work together to solve these very complex problems.

I'm so very glad that this class of 2006 and our recent adoptee from Ohio is taking on not just health care but energy and education. These are the three essential problems that the President has been leading us on.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If I can just add something, Mr. KAGEN brings

in energy policy, and we just got through a long, hard struggle of passing an energy bill on this floor, and we're right now engaged in the muck of trying to change this health care system.

I think it's just worth reminding everybody out there how hard this is going to be, right, how hard it's going to be to try to reform a health care system where, as Mr. RYAN said, a lot of money is being wasted. But that money that is being wasted, it's not like you're wasting heat in your house and it just sort of escapes into the atmosphere.

When we talk about wasting money, we talk about money that actually ends up in people's pockets, right, that makes them rich and creates their fortune. So when we talk about saving money within the health care system, that involves taking on some pretty powerful institutions around this city of Washington, D.C., and around this country that are going to have to live with a little bit less in order to get average Americans a little bit more.

And I think people are going to read all these stories in the paper about, boy, how long it's taken to pass health care reform and how tough it is to get the Senate and the House to agree. Listen, when you are taking on one-seventh of the economy, when you're taking on the industry which by years of Republican neglect has allowed for some big players in the health care industry to make their fortunes off of the fact that some people can't afford it, then it's going to take some time, going to take some heavy lifting to fix a problem that has festered for a long time.

Now, the same thing is going to go for energy. That's why energy is going to be so hard to do. It's taking on a lot of similar interests, but health care reform is not just a nice, practical policy discussion amongst intellectual peers. This is about taking on some vested interests.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. About 2 years ago, I heard a number, and I think this is roughly correct, where the insurance industry had increased their employment by maybe 5 or 6 or 7 percent, and they decreased the amount of services that they were providing by, like, 25 or 30 percent. So they were taking this money, hiring people to knock people off the rolls, to not cover, to make them jump through these hoops. I call, I got denied. Well, I'm sick. I need to go now, call. I get denied. Call, you get denied. Then eventually maybe they call us and maybe we make a call and who knows what happened, you get lucky, you get somebody.

But to your point, that person who's hiring people, growing their business at the expense of all of these other people is not the way this is going to keep going because America is better when all of these people together are healthier and more productive and participating in the system.

And I want to yield to my friend from Tennessee because he caught me

before my friend from Wisconsin, but there was an article yesterday that was brought to our attention about people in technology businesses that, for whatever reason, want to go out and start their own business but can't because someone in their family or they have a preexisting condition, so they need to stay in their current job because they don't have the coverage when they could be out in the market using what's best in America, the entrepreneurship, to generate new employment.

Mr. COHEN. Before we yield back to Mr. YARMUTH to close, I just want to thank Mr. RYAN for bringing up the issue of bankruptcy. I chair the Commercial and Administrative Law Subcommittee of Judiciary, and next week we're going to have a hearing on bankruptcies and health care. Health care is the major cause of bankruptcies in this country, and Elizabeth Edwards will be one of our witnesses.

But when people go bankrupt because of high medical bills, then other folks lose out because they don't get paid either. Merchants don't get paid because of that bankruptcy. So that's another cost of not having this health care system, and I want to thank each of you.

Mr. YARMUTH. I'd like to yield again to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. I'd like to dovetail on both of these conversations and say that Mr. RYAN from Ohio pointed out the difference between health insurance and health care, and what we are talking about in this bill is health care, getting the care that you need. You have the choice, you've got the coverage, and you've got the costs coming down. That's exactly what this bill aims to do.

Mr. YARMUTH. I appreciate all the comments from my colleagues, and I'd like to close by reading a letter that I received from a constituent of mine who's 10 years old.

It says: "Dear Congressman Yarmuth," My name is Matthew Gregory, and I am a 10-year-old that lives in Louisville, Kentucky.

"I am writing this letter because I have a younger brother with autism, and I want you to cosponsor the Autism Treatment Acceleration Act." Not the piece of legislation we're talking about now, but relevant.

"I would really appreciate the efforts you would provide to cosponsor the bill that would help end autism insurance discrimination. My parents spend \$50,000 per year for my brother's autism, and I think it's a national crisis.

"It seems like families that have not had their State's autism insurance bills passed have to pay unnecessary expenses just because a child is different."

And here's the kicker. "It's just not fair, and this is a fair country and everybody, no matter who they are, including my brother Eric, should be treated equally."

So there you have it. A 10-year-old understands the essential unfairness of

the system we have now, the fact that so many people are uninsured, the fact that so many people pay too much for the insurance they have, have to make life decisions based on whether they can get insurance or not, and that's what this Congress is determined to correct.

We have an historic opportunity here to create a just, fair health care system, one that is affordable and sustainable for this country and which will make sure that every American citizen has the health care he and she needs for their families well into the future.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Well, good evening, Mr. Speaker and my friends. We have just heard from the Democrats talking about their new foray into solving all the problems with health care, and boy, did it sound good to me. I have to say it really sounded good.

The promises, essentially what I was hearing talk about, first of all, the costs are coming down and you're going to get free medical care and the quality of the care is going to go up. And gosh, if you were given a proposal like that, I don't see why anybody wouldn't say, Yeah, let's just march right ahead with socialized medicine. Let's let the government run it because they're going to bring the costs down, they're going to give you free medical care, and you're going to get even better coverage than you get now.

I also was hearing the fact that they talked about the muck of our health care system and how bad the health care system is, and how, if we don't immediately pass this legislation, that things are going to get even worse. But what we have in front of us is this absolutely euphoric view of a great health care system.

Well, first thing off that strikes me is a little bit of a problem with common sense, the first is, if our health care system were so bad, then it would seem like, to me, that Americans would be going to some foreign country to get their health care. But what I'm observing is that if I got sick—and I have been sick—the place that I'd like to be treated is in good old U.S.A. I don't want to go to Canada. I don't want to go to Great Britain. I don't want to go to France or Sweden. I don't want to go to Russia. No, I'd like to be sick right here in this country.

So it strikes me that a health care system that most people even around the world recognize as probably the most sophisticated and the best quality health care system in the world, we're saying that it is full of muck and that the system has to be completely changed around.

And so it's okay if you want to believe these promises, that what's going

to happen when the government takes over the health care system is that it's going to cost less money. The trouble is the Congressional Budget Office doesn't say that and the estimates of the costs don't say that. And the States that have tried using the same approach that's being proposed here nationally, they don't say that either, because those States are almost bankrupt for trying to do this kind of a system, and yet, we're going to try to copy those bad examples.

We are just actually a few weeks, a couple, 3 weeks away from dealing with the other big problem that the administration has identified, which is the fact that the climate and the Earth is going to get worse and worse, hotter and hotter, and we are going to melt down. So we've got to deal with the problem of global warming by, what would you expect, a very, very large tax increase, the largest tax increase in the history of our country. I guess it was about \$787 billion. That was the largest tax increase that we've done. We did that.

It was an 1,100-page bill that was brought to the floor, and then at 3 o'clock in the morning, in a special committee hearing, another 300 pages of extra text were added to the 1,100 pages, and the 300 pages being in the form of amendments to had to be collated and put into the 1,100 pages. So, as we were debating this wonderful bill on the floor, they were busy trying to collate this amendment that had been passed, 300-page amendment, at 3 o'clock in the morning. They're busy trying to collate that. So, as we're debating it here on the floor about to take a vote on it, there isn't even a copy of the bill that we're going to vote on.

So here we go again. Perhaps we did learn from our last experience that it's easier to pass something that people don't know what it is. And so here we go now with about 1,000 pages of bill in terms of what we're going to do to have the government take over 20 percent of the U.S. economy. The health care business is about 20 percent of the money that's spent in America. It's about 20 percent, or close to it, of our economy, and now we're going to have the government take—well, if you take a look at it, about half of it the government's already running with Medicare and Medicaid. So we've had some experience with the government running these programs.

The Medicaid program, of course, is noted for the tremendous amount of fraud and abuse that it has, but if you add the Medicaid and Medicare money, if you take a look at the total money we spent in health care, government's doing about half of it right now, but we're talking about having the government do the rest of it. And so that's where we're going, and I think we need to take a look at that.

When the government does take over various things, what tends to happen?

Is it noted for its efficiency? Well, usually what happens when the government takes over programs is you get tremendous excess in amount of spending. You get a lot of bureaucratic rationing. These are typical things in government programs. There's an inefficiency and a degraded quality. Those are the kinds of things that history would tell us happens when the government takes something over. That's what's being proposed here. Make no doubt about it, what's being proposed is the government is going to take over the health care system. And that has left people with this particular quip that, if you think health care is expensive now, just wait until it gets to be free. Then you will see what real expense means.

Well, let's take a look at how well this has worked in the past. One way you can tell whether it's a good idea to make a move or to do something particularly is to take a look at other people who have tried the same thing.

The State of Massachusetts decided in 2006 that they were going to require universal health care coverage that's very much like the current Democrat plan where people are required to purchase specific levels of health insurance.

□ 1915

Well, here's what happened. Health care costs have risen 42 percent since 2006—42 percent increase. Now we were just hearing from the Democrats that this thing isn't going to hardly cost anything. This is going to be a break-even because there's so much efficiency.

Well, what sort of efficiency is a 42 percent increase? And yet, health care access is down and the patients have to wait more than 2 months to try to get to see a doctor. So, is this the kind of thing that we think is going to improve what most people think is the best health care system in the world?

Health care costs now up in Massachusetts, they're 133 percent of the national average. Well, that doesn't seem to me to be producing these glorious results that I hear the Democrats talk about.

I just don't think that these people may have gotten over their euphoria from just managing to put 1,100 pages, with 300 pages that nobody could read or know what it was, and pass that within a day of the three o'clock in the morning when they made the amendments.

So here we go again. We're going to see if we can't pass another 1,000 or 2,000-page bill this week or next week—and it's a lot easier to pass them when people don't read them.

I'm joined here this evening by some very, very good friends of mine and some people who've done a number of years of study on the health care issue. I think that we need to talk a little bit about this. Before we go racing off to make some snap decisions, I think that we need to do that.

I'm joined by a number of my colleagues. I would yield to the gentleman. If you want some charts, help yourself.

This is Congressman SHADEGG. He's from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I just want to put up some charts, if I could. We have got boring charts here.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. And hopefully we can do this where we are all in a conversation and no one of us talks in a monologue. That makes it more interesting.

I want to thank the gentleman for standing up. I, like he, watched the Democrats in their Special Order that preceded this. And I thought some things were very interesting. On the one hand, there are things that I think we agree on. Our Democrat colleagues said that it is tragic when someone has a preexisting condition or a chronic illness and because of that preexisting condition or illness they can't get care.

That's one of the reasons why we Republicans believe that the health care system in America desperately needs to be reformed. And the health care bill put forward by every Republican that I know of says we need to make sure that every American with a preexisting condition or a chronic illness can get health care costs at roughly the same price as Americans who are healthy.

Indeed, I introduced and the Congress passed a number of years ago a bill called the State High Risk Insurance Pool bill that encouraged all 50 States in America to create high-risk pools so that for someone for whom they have an illness and that illness or that chronic condition has caused their health care cost to rise and they either can't get health care at all or they can only get health care at an extraordinary high price, they have the option of going into a State high risk pool and getting health care at the same cost. That's not an issue that divides us. That's an issue we agree on.

In addition, they expressed concern about those who are uninsured in America. The bill that I've cosponsored, and I see several of the gentlemen and ladies who have cosponsored it with me today, the Ensuring Health Care for All Americans Act, that bill provides health insurance for every single American. It says we are going to provide care to everyone.

And our Democrat colleagues say, Yeah, we think every American should be able to get care. There's another issue where we agree with our Democrat colleagues. But where we don't agree is how they propose to do it, because they want a top-down, government-controlled, one-plan-fits-all, you're-just-one-little-cog-in-a-very-large-wheel plan. And that's what the bill they introduced today will do.

I have to ask a question. I think that the biggest issue in the health care debate is cost. Most Americans are pretty satisfied with their health insurance. Eighty-three percent say they're happy. But every American is concerned about cost.

And I listened when the Democrats introduced their bill today. And the chairman of my committee, Mr. WAXMAN, said the big issue here is cost. And so the Democrats are going to fix that cost.

Now I don't quite understand how they're going to fix that cost by raising taxes \$1.5 trillion to create a massive new government, one-size-fits-all health care plan.

But I really, really have this burning question. Anybody in America can answer it, anybody in the room can answer it, any of my Democrats colleagues out there watching tonight can answer it. Please show me the last time when we got government involved and took over a private sector activity, that the cost of something went down.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time, gentleman, I think you have asked an absolutely great question, because we just heard an hour from the Democrats. That was their whole point.

Their whole point is: We're going to somehow make the costs go down, which is a little hard to reconcile with a \$1.5 trillion estimate. We saw 3 weeks ago that we jammed through the biggest tax increase in the history of this country. What was it—a \$787 billion tax on energy? Anybody who flips the light switch is going to get taxed. And that's just a drop in the bucket compared to what we want to spend. And somehow this is supposed to be efficiency. That really stretches long on the conscience.

We have a number of medical doctors here today, and what I was just thinking about, Dr. ROE is from Tennessee. Did you put a program similar to this into Tennessee, and did you find that it really helped the economy of your State? I'd like to yield a little bit of time, then go to the doctor from Georgia as well in just a moment.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I certainly don't want to take credit for putting that in.

Mr. AKIN. I wasn't going to blame you for that, gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. What happened in Tennessee was we had a lot of uninsured in Tennessee, and it was a very noble goal of trying to cover as many people as we could. And we had a standard Medicare plan like most States do now. We got a Medicare waiver from HHS, the Department of Health and Human Services, to form a managed care plan for the State.

And what happened was, it was a plan that was very rich in benefits, much like you're seeing in this plan and that we heard discussed last hour. Provided a lot of benefits but not much access, we found out.

And what happened was, this plan, this public plan paid only about 60 percent. Now it pays less than, I found out the other day, less than 60 percent of the costs of actually providing the care. Medicare pays about 90 percent.

So businesses and individuals made a perfectly logical decision. They dropped their private coverage, and about 45 percent of the people who are

on TennCare had private health insurance coverage, but chose to drop it.

Well, that was fine until we got the bill in the State. What happened was the bills kept piling up until they consumed more of the State budget than education did.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time for a minute. One of the troubles with doctors is you guys are so smart, you go pretty fast. You're going to have to slow this down.

What happened was the State government said, We're going to give you medical insurance. And so a bunch of people signed up for that. Then the companies that had the private insurance, they dropped theirs because you could go get the freebie stuff from the government. Then, guess what happened? The government stuff got really expensive and now the State's in trouble.

We have a Congresswoman that I greatly respect, Congresswoman BLACKBURN from Tennessee also. Do you have some more facts? I mean, you lived with it. I yield.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Dr. ROE is exactly right. He was a physician practicing medicine or trying to practice medicine under the impact of TennCare. I was a legislator trying to figure out how to pay for this as a member of the Tennessee State Senate.

Mr. AKIN. Wait a minute. The Democrats just said this is going to be really cheap. It's not going to be hard to pay for.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. That's one of the interesting things. You know, Tennessee's TennCare program was put in place in 1994 as the test case for public option, government-funded, government-delivered health care. The interesting thing now is the White House doesn't want to talk about it because it is an experiment that was not successful. It failed. Even our Democrat Governor has said it has been a disaster.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the Governor of the State said it was a disaster in Tennessee?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Yes. And one of the things we need to realize is this. TennCare was put in place as an executive order program of the Office of the Governor. It was an 1115 waiver from CMS. The Statehouse and the State Senate got the bill of paying for it.

What happened after about 5 years of this program being in place, and you had consent decrees and court orders, you had companies that were dropping insurance, 55 percent of the enrollees on the program were people that were not supposed to be there. They had previously had insurance.

And you had a program that was ensuring or covering—gold-plated program covering 25 percent of the State's residents. Then the cost starts to balloon. You see cost shifting taking place onto those who have private insurance. You see restricted access by doctors and hospitals because they're not being paid by the program, because there's

not enough money to go around, and the cost of the program goes to the point that they are actually absorbing every single new revenue dollar that is coming into the State of Tennessee, and ends up being 36 percent of the State's budget.

Mr. SHADEGG. Would the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I'll gladly yield.

Mr. SHADEGG. I just want to make sure I understand this. So, our Democrats colleagues say the big issue here is cost. Costs are going up too fast. The President said it's unsustainable.

In Tennessee they put in a government-run plan, got the government involved, substituted the private market, and costs did not go down?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Costs skyrocketed. And we saw the costs go up every single year. As Dr. ROE can tell you, having been a physician trying to handle this issue, every single year the costs went up on the public option, the access was restricted, the quality of care was diminished, and those with private insurance saw their rates go up 10 percent, 15 percent.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, what you're depicting sounds like to me is one of those things they used to do, they charge people money. They get a railroad track with two huge steam locomotives, they charge them money, and they'd run them. It was a classic train wreck.

It sounds like basically what happened was the government engineered a train wreck in health insurance.

Dr. ROE, you were the doctor—you're a medical doctor. I assume you got into the doctoring business because you wanted to take care of people. What was it like to be there?

I yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Well, one of the things when I got to Congress here and I began to hear the plan, I said, Well, we tried that already in the State of Tennessee. This is nothing new. It failed. And can you say failed? It was a disaster.

And the Governor ran in 2002—our Democratic Governor—his platform was fixing TennCare. Fixing what 6, 8 years later was a mess in the State of Tennessee.

Now there are good parts of this plan, as we pointed out. Things we will agree on. And I do want to show the public one thing. I almost broke my printer in the office this afternoon. But this is the bill that came out this afternoon, just to give you an idea what we're going to talk about in the next couple of days.

Mr. SHADEGG. I believe it's 1,100 pages long.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It's 1,100 pages.

Mr. SHADEGG. The discussion draft was 600 pages. This is 1,100 pages. And if they do what they did on cap-and-trade, it will explode on the day of the vote to what, 1,400 pages with the last-minute 300-page amendment.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. This is where the devil is in the details, right here.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BROUN of GEORGIA. It's interesting. After our last series of votes I was walking into my office. As I went into the Cannon House Office Building, there was a Democrat engaged in this process.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, I'd like to introduce the gentleman, because you're a medical doctor also. You got in the business to practice medicine. You're not from Tennessee. You're from Georgia. But Dr. BROUN is a respected expert on the subject of health care because you have been doing it all your life. And I'm just thankful that we have you here. I'd like to you to continue commenting where we are because this is a very important discussion.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. AKIN. It was humorous to me—actually, sad to me—because this Democrat, she said to me that all they're going to do is cover those who are not insured with this public option and give them the opportunity to buy into this public option if they don't have insurance. And I told her, How are you going to keep companies from canceling their insurance and from people being shifted over? That's going to increase the cost of insurance for everybody else, and so you're going to see just a continual shifting.

Isn't that, Dr. ROE or Mrs. BLACKBURN, isn't that what you all saw in Tennessee?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank you. I will give a brief answer to that and then I know Dr. ROE will also want to comment on it. It's so wonderful that we can talk from the perspective of a State senator who was charged with holding that program accountable, even though it was set up without the permission, without the permission of either the Statehouse or the State senate in the State of Tennessee. And Dr. ROE was charged with keeping his oath and making certain that he was providing care to those that were in his care.

□ 1930

But what we saw, again, was the cost shifting that was taking place, the cost of the insurance to those in the private markets going through the roof.

I have employers in my State senate district and now in my congressional district who have seen, over a 3-year period of time, their health insurance cost go up 100 percent. We also saw delayed care. And as the gentleman from Arizona knows, delayed care might as well be denied care.

Mr. SHADEGG. Would the gentlelady yield just on that point?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I do yield.

Mr. SHADEGG. By the way, our colleagues are saying, let's go to a Canadian-style system, something that gets the government more involved. Well, we all know Canada has a single-payer system. Some of us believe that those

on the other side of the aisle want to create exactly that, a single-payer system, but they just want to transition to it.

I think it is very important, you said that the right to access to care is not the right to care. Actually that is exactly what the Supreme Court of Canada ruled about their single-payer system. The chief justice, and this is on this chart next to me which I thank the gentlelady for allowing me to put up, Chief Justice Beverly McLaughlin of the Canadian Supreme Court said in an opinion, which was issued in 2005, access to a waiting list is not access to health care, an opinion in which the Supreme Court of Canada ruled that you couldn't be forced to stay in their system, you had to be given the right to get outside of the government program and get the care you need. So to the point the gentlelady was making, access to a waiting list is not access to health care.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time a second, now this supreme court justice, she was no right-wing conservative?

Mr. SHADEGG. She was no right-wing conservative.

Mr. AKIN. By politic standards of America, she would be considered liberal. Yet she is saying that this socialized system doesn't work. And access, just because you have insurance, doesn't do you any good. You can have a free C-section, but if you have to wait 12 months, it doesn't do you much good.

Mr. SHADEGG. If you have to wait 12 months, it doesn't do you much good at all. I believe our colleague could comment on that more credibly than we could.

I just want to make the point: we don't want this. We Republicans want a system that responds to patients. We want patient-centered care. We don't want to give Americans access to a government waiting list. We want to give them access to actual health care.

Mr. AKIN. I yield back to Congressman BROWN from Georgia. I think you had the floor for a moment there, and then I'm going to go to Congressman GINGREY, another medical doctor we have joining us. We have a lot of doctors here tonight, and I'm very thankful for your expertise, my friends.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank Mr. AKIN for yielding again to me.

I want to come back to something that my dear friend JOHN SHADEGG said where he is talking about cost. I just wanted to inject here something that happened in my medical practice when I was practicing down in southwest Georgia. And what I'm fixing to say is going to point out that government intrusion in the health care system is what has driven up the cost for everybody, whether they are private insurers or public insurers on Medicare, SCHIP or Medicaid.

Back a number of years ago, I was in private practice. I had a one-man office with several employees. And I had a fully automated lab in my office. A pa-

tient would come in to see me with a red sore throat, running a fever, aching all over, coughing, runny nose and white patches on their throat. In my fully automated lab, I would do a CBC, a complete blood count. I could do that in 5 minutes and charge \$12.

Well, Congress passed a bill and signed into law what is called the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act, or CLIA. It shut down my lab. It shut down every doctor's lab in this country. All the hospital labs had to get a waiver—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, the laws passed here in Congress shut down a lab that you had to be able to treat people that had an upper respiratory type of infection?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Anything, to do blood sugars and blood counts and those sort of things.

Mr. AKIN. They shut it down?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They shut it down. CLIA shut every doctor's lab in the country. Patients would come in with aching all over, a red sore throat, and so I would do a CBC to see if they had a bacterial infection and thus needed antibiotics, if there was a strep throat that might need a penicillin shot, or if they had a viral infection that could look exactly the same. And a viral infection is not helped by antibiotics. The teaching in the Medical College of Georgia and all of my training postgraduate has encouraged doctors not to overprescribe medications. It is costly. It increases the cost to everybody. Also, if people have viral infections, they don't need antibiotics. Actually, it is harmful to some patients.

So, I do a CBC, 12 bucks, 5 minutes. CLIA shut my lab down. I had to send patients across the way to the hospital. They got a waiver. It cost \$75 and took 2 to 3 hours for one test. Now do you see what that does across the whole health care system? It markedly increased the cost.

Congress not just a few years ago passed HIPPA, the Health Insurance Portability and Privacy Act. That has cost the health care industry, thus insurance and all of us, billions of dollars. It has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches it has created. It was totally unneeded legislation. It was totally unneeded because we could have done something to make insurance portable without going that route.

So, government intrusion into the health care system and Medicare policy is what has driven up the cost for everybody. And it comes back to what Mr. SHADEGG was saying about asking a question, could any of us answer the question about has government's being involved in any area decreased the cost. And the answer is "no." It has increased the cost markedly for the health insurance of everybody else. And it is going to in this too.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I think you have really given us several very concrete examples in the health

care business where the government involvement has basically run the cost of health care up. That is not a big surprise, is it? Because as we look at the regular marketplace, I think one of the examples would be the idea of Lasic surgery for eyes. That is one thing the government didn't get its big fingers into meddling, right? And laser technology has come along, and what used to cost thousands of dollars for a procedure now is done for hundreds of dollars. And so we have seen a dramatic decrease in the cost of good quality care just because the government wasn't tampering in it. Yet every time we see the government gets its fingers into things, the costs invariably go up.

I would like to get over to Congressman GINGREY from Georgia, another medical doctor joining us with many years of medical practice, also a former senator from Georgia and a great colleague. I yield time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague for yielding.

It is a pleasure to be on the floor with my colleagues talking about this bill that was finally, as we all know, introduced by Speaker PELOSI at a press conference this afternoon. And hearing our colleagues from Tennessee talk about really the ultimate pilot project, we are always in Medicare, anytime they are trying to do something to improve a situation, we start with a pilot project, which makes sense.

Well, this was the ultimate pilot project, I think, this TennCare that Congresswoman BLACKBURN and Dr. ROE, Congressman ROE, have described to us; and as their Democratic Governor said, it was a complete abysmal failure.

Mr. AKIN. We are going to repeat this? Please continue.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will continue to yield, and yet we are going to repeat this now on a grand national scale.

I want to just take a few minutes to talk about what the Blue Dog Democrats said to their leadership just last week in a letter that was sent to the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, Madam Speaker, and the Honorable STENY HOYER, the majority leader of the Democrats. And 40—I think there are 52 Members of the Blue Dog Coalition of Democrats, those Members who are a little more conservative than the typical moderate to liberal Democrats, and basically these 40 Members, 40 out of 52, and there are a number of things in their letter, but I just want to go over a couple. One of the provisions that they say that absolutely needed fixing in this bill before they could support it is small business protections.

Here is what it says: Any additional requirements for employers must be carefully considered and done so within the context of what is currently offered. Small business owners and their employees lack coverage because of high and unstable costs, not because of

any unwillingness to provide or purchase it. We cannot support a bill that further exacerbates the challenges faced by small businesses.

Now, look, my colleagues, what this bill says that just came out today, this is the burden, the additional burden that will be put on small businesses. If the payroll of a business does not exceed \$250,000, then there is no surtax. But if the payroll exceeds \$250,000 to \$300,000, there is a 2 percent surtax. If the payroll exceeds \$350,000 but does not exceed \$400,000, there is a 6 percent tax on small business, and if the payroll exceeds only \$400,000, there is an 8 percent surtax on these small businesses.

What I want to make sure everybody in this Chamber understands is that these small businesses are not subchapter; they are not C corporations. They are Subchapter S or they are sole proprietors. And they pay as an individual. And this is on top of the fact that President Obama is going to let the tax cuts expire that President Bush put in place in 2001 and 2003.

Mr. AKIN. Just reclaiming my time for a minute, what you brought up is an absolutely critical point. It is part of how they are going to try and pay for this humdinger bill. And what you are saying is they are going after small business.

Now a lot of us know small businesses have 500 employees or less, and they create 80 percent of the new jobs that are created typically in the economy. So if you target small business, now you are going to drive down employment. And that is significant.

I yield the gentleman from Arizona time.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am shocked. As I stand here, I have to tell you I'm absolutely shocked. I understand that the gentleman from Georgia was reading from the bill just now?

You're reading provisions of the bill that was released today?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I am reading directly from that provision, taxes on employers and individuals.

Mr. SHADEGG. So you have read a portion of this bill?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I have read a portion of this bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. And I suggest that you also read from a letter written by Blue Dog Democrats, conservative Democrats, to their leadership expressing concerns about provisions of the bill before it was released today, the so-called "Tri-Committee Discussion Draft." So are you telling me that Blue Dog Democrats have read portions of the bill?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. The gentleman from Arizona is absolutely right. One of the provisions that they stated in the letter is this, finally, any health care reform legislation that comes to the floor must be available to all Members and to the public for a sufficient amount of time before we are asked to vote for it.

Mr. SHADEGG. I'm just stunned. I have here beside me a quote from the

House majority leader which suggests that it is not appropriate in America for us to expect Members of Congress to read bills. As a matter of fact, the majority leader said, if every Member pledged not to vote for it—"it" being this health care bill—if they hadn't read it in its entirety, I think we would have very few votes.

He said last week, he laughed out loud—laughed out loud at the notion that Members might actually read a bill. I suppose if you had done what he did, which is on the cap-and-trade bill, introduced at 3:04 in the morning a 309-page amendment which made it impossible for a single Member to read the bill before it was voted on at 4 p.m. that afternoon or 5 p.m. that afternoon, then I guess you would have to say, gosh, we don't want Members to read bills. But as I understand it, you're reading this bill, and so are these Blue Dogs, reading the bill?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I can respond to the gentleman from Arizona, absolutely, and again in this letter, and I'm quoting directly from the letter: too short of a review period is unacceptable and only undermines Congress' ability to pass responsible health care reform that works for all Americans.

And our colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, just held up that 1,100-page bill. I wonder when they are going to get around to reading it. And I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to yield time to Congresswoman BLACKBURN from Tennessee. I think you had a point.

And also the stack of that, that is just the beginning of the bill, and it has already given my eyes a headache from looking. What do you have, close to 9 or 10 inches of paper stacked up there, Doctor? That is just where we are now. We haven't done the amendments at 3 o'clock in the morning yet.

I do yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank you. What we see in this stack of the bill, the 1,100 pages that are there in that bill, 1,683 times it gives you the directive of you "shall do," individuals "shall do" this. Now let me explain what this means. When you are a mother, many times you will tell your children, well, you can go out and play if you want to or you can do this if you want to. But when you really want to make a point, you say, "you are going to go to time out" or "you are going to go to this corner" or "you are going to do your homework, no question, no options."

□ 1945

In legislative parlance, that is what "shall" means. You have to do this.

Now, 47 times it uses the word "must." You must do this and that. And 495 times it uses the word "require." All of these are new mandates on the American people.

To make it worse, 172 times it talks about taxes, taxpayer, taxable activity, 172 times, and 99 times it uses "penalties."

The Democrats have become the party of punishment, and they are going to punish Americans severely in this health care bill.

And to the gentleman from Georgia, I loved the fact that he talked about the taxes. That portion that he so beautifully articulated, would create \$300 billion in new revenue for the government, which means taxes out of your pocket that you're taking out of your pocket and handing to the tax man; \$300 billion. Even the prices—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I just heard promise this thing doesn't cost that much, and yet the Congressional Budget Office, the original version was 3.5 trillion, and they've whittled it down to only 1.5 trillion is what we understand. And you're only talking \$300 billion. And we did that huge, the biggest tax increase in the history of our country on energy taxes which is going to hurt our productivity, and that's only not even 800 billion. We're not there yet.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. You're exactly right. And what the gentleman has is one small portion of that bill.

And also, I would add, before I yield back, that his own economic advisor from—the President's economic advisor estimates that that amount of taxes and this legislation would cost us 4.7 million new jobs.

And I yield back.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentlelady will yield briefly, I just point out that for you to know all of those numbers shows that you are very much involved in the process of reading this bill. Your staff is involved in the process of reading the bill. I said facetiously to our colleague from Georgia yesterday that I was stunned that people were reading the bill. I just want to make the point I am really stunned that the majority leader made the comment that Members shouldn't be expected to read the bill. I know I won't vote for this bill until I have read it and been over it.

I compliment the gentlelady's staff for poring through the bill, finding those statistics. I compliment the gentleman from Georgia for obviously reading portions of the bill and for his dedication. And everyone here, I think the American people expect us to read the bill. And I just wanted to make it clear that I was only being facetious when I expressed stun and shock that we might read a bill. I think it's my job to know what's in these bills.

I would be happy to yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I just signed a pledge this afternoon to the American people that I will not vote for this bill until I read it, and I meant that. I don't sign pledges—

Mr. SHADEGG. I hope our colleagues on the other side will do the same.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I hope they will, too.

I applaud the Blue Dogs for asking from the leadership. I hope they don't

hold their breath because I think they'll turn blue and die from hypoxia.

But I want to point out something that Dr. GINGREY was talking about that, and that Ms. BLACKBURN brought up very clearly. This tax increase on small business is going to cost jobs, not 1 or 2, not 10 or 20, not 100, but thousands of jobs, because small businesses all across this country are not going to be able to pay for the increased taxes that the Democrats are going to put on the back of small business men and women around this country. So many people are going to be out of work, and it's going to shift them over to the public plan. They're going to get free health care.

We have heard several of our colleagues say, if you think health care is expensive now, wait till you get it when it's free. It's going to be extremely expensive.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time just a second, I'd like to go back over to Dr. ROE.

You were there. You're in Tennessee. You saw this experiment. Even the Democrat Governor said it was a failure. I'd like you to just finish fleshing—we have just a few minutes left. If you could finish, and then I'll close.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Let me go over why it's important for the public and my patients and, as physicians, our patients to understand this. What we're concerned about is if this plan becomes a public option and that's the only option. And the way that occurs is, I've explained, when the cost of the public plan does not pay for the cost of the care, more costs are shifted to your private health insurers, meaning that they'll eventually drop the plan.

Now, having a single-payer system like Canada or England, is that necessarily bad? Well, I would argue that it is in America, and the reason is because it's going to limit choices.

And I know it was brought up just a moment ago by the gentleman from Arizona about costs, and I'm going to share with you—just a family practitioner in my own district the other day called me up and said, Bill, he said, I have had one lawsuit in my career. A very young woman had a serious problem, probably not preventable. He had a grade by the insurance companies of what a good doctor he was, in the top third, always. After this one lawsuit, and nowhere is medical malpractice mentioned here, his referral to specialists in 1 year went up 350 percent. His lab ordering went up 550 percent. This is not him saying this. This is a grade he got from the insurance companies. So there is the cost side that we were talking about earlier, and who knows, when you extrapolate that across the country, how much that must be.

Now, I got this letter right here this afternoon from CBO to Chairman RANGEL, 14th of July, today. And in this, it says, Another significant feature of the insurance exchanges is that they will include a public plan that largely pays

Medicare-based rates for medical goods and services. CBO estimates that the premiums for that plan would generally be lower than the premiums for private insurance. But on average, the public plan would be about 10 percent cheaper than the typical private plan offered in the exchanges, and therefore, they're saying right here in this document that that's what's going to happen.

The other thing about this I found interesting was this plan doesn't start until 2013. And what you're seeing here is only in the last 6 years, this \$1.1 trillion plan. It actually is 150 billion per year is what it amounts to. It's not what they're currently saying it's going to be, a trillion over 10 years. It's really a trillion-plus over 6 years.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just, I told Congressman SHADEGG from Arizona I'm going to get him in. He had a couple of points, and we're going to jump over to you, Doctor. We'll get right over to you. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I'll try to be as brief as I can.

I want to point out that the Democrats' bill was not the only bill introduced today. As many of my colleagues here note, we introduced the Improving Health Care for All Americans Act today. It's a bill that reforms health care, not top down government edict, government mandate. It reforms American health care bottom up. It controls costs by empowering Americans, and it has some key points.

It says, if you like it, you can keep it. It provides coverage for every single American and choice for every single American. It provides new pooling mechanisms so that you could be in an insurance pool other than your employer's pool. It says that the Kiwanis International or the Rotary International or the Daughters of the American Revolution or your alumni association of your college or university could sponsor a plan. So you could pick many pools to get into.

It also says we're going to cover pre-existing conditions or people with chronic conditions at the same rates as everyone else, by cross-subsidization and high-risk pools.

But I wanted to make, because I have some charts here, two quick points very quickly, and I'd invite anybody else who speaks in the limited time we have left to comment on these because I think they're so important.

The President has said over and over and over again, if you like it, you can keep it. I think that's so important, because polls show roughly 83 percent of Americans, 83 percent of Americans, like the health care they have. So if the President stands forth and says, if you like it, you can keep it, ladies and gentlemen, I wish it were true.

This is the language of the bill which was introduced today. It's been revised and renumbered. This came from the

working draft, but the same language is in the bill. It says, by the end of the 5-year period following the introduction of the bill, group health insurance plans, every group health insurance plan must meet the minimum benefit requirements under section 121. Section 121 creates a new Federal entity called the Health Care Advisory Committee, which will rewrite the minimum benefits for every health care plan in America. That means every health care plan in America, under their bill, will change within 5 years. Some will change immediately. Everyone will change within 5 years.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, so what you're saying is, if you like it, you won't be able to keep it. That isn't true.

Mr. SHADEGG. If you like it, like the headline says right here, if you like it, if you like your care, if you're one of those 83 percent of Americans, be prepared to lose it, because you're going to lose it under their bill, not just by competition from the public plan. Their bill says you'll lose it. In 5 years, every plan has to change.

I will conclude very briefly on an issue that I know is near and dear to the gentleman who sponsored this special hour tonight, Special Order tonight, our friend Mr. AKIN, who's a cancer survivor.

The American people, I hope, will slow down this process. I hope they'll say, We want to see what's in this bill. But I hope they'll ask this question and understand this information. We are being told to switch to a system similar to what exists in Canada, Europe and England. Those are the parallels.

But I would suggest to my colleagues and to every American, there are two things that scare every American. Those two things are cancers. For men, it's prostate cancer. For women, it's breast cancer. And these are hard facts.

This chart shows you that the 5-year survival rate in the United States for prostate cancer is dramatically better than Canada. It is stunningly better than Europe, and it is shockingly better than in England. So, if you have prostate cancer in America, your chance of surviving after 5 years are dramatically better in the United States than in the system the Democrats are telling us we ought to adopt.

But that's not enough, because every woman in America goes to bed each night worrying about breast cancer, and I would suggest every husband in America goes to bed worrying about breast cancer. And here are the facts.

If you look at 5-year survival rates for breast cancer, once again, the United States, the system they want to throw out, you have a dramatically better, significantly better chance of surviving than Canada, even more dramatically better chance of surviving 5 years than if you lived in Europe, and even better than that, of surviving 5 years, than if you lived in England. Before we adopt a Canadian, a European,

or a British system of health care, we better know that the survival rates for these cancers, the cancers that scare most Americans more than any other, are significantly worse in those countries than in the United States of America.

Mr. AKIN. I promised I was going to yield over to the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend Mr. HOEKSTRA, and I will come back over to you, Doctor, in just a minute. Congressman HOEKSTRA.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Okay. I'd like to speak to Mr. SHADEGG's point there before he leaves if he could stick around a second.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank my colleagues for allowing me to just be a part of this discussion for a few minutes.

You know, it's interesting. As my colleague from Arizona is pointing out the differences between the U.S. system, the Canadian system, and the British system, and I think one of the things that you see there is in America you've got competition, so the hospitals are all working to improve their survival rates. If you get a certain type of disease or illness, you know, people will check the various performance rates by hospitals, by clinics, as to where it's working.

You know, I just—this bill now is 1,000 pages. It's over 1,000. We just went through a massive cap-and-trade and tax bill. But, you know, I just opened it up, and one of the things that people say, Don't worry. There's still going to be improvement and competition to get excellence.

You know what job I want? Start on page 84. I want to be the commissioner. The commissioner shall specify the benefits. The next page, The commissioner shall establish the following standards. You go to page 87, The commissioner shall establish a permissible range. If the State has entered into an arrangement satisfactory to the commissioner, page 88, the commissioner shall, the commissioner shall. I mean, it's like—and this is in 2 minutes of looking at this bill. And it's like, well, it looks like the commissioner knows what to do. And if the commissioner's going to do all of this, what's there left for me? It looks like the commissioner's going to take over my health care.

Mr. AKIN. Are you sure you're spelling that word right? It doesn't say "czar"?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I was thinking it sounds like czar. Coming from Michigan, we've had enough of czars. We've had enough of car czars, you know, who are running our automobile industry, who are making decisions about which car company will survive, how they will survive, who will manage the companies, who will be on the board of directors, what dealers will survive. I mean, you know—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentleman, we're talking about the Presi-

dent of the United States firing the President of General Motors. We got ourselves into the insurance business, into the banking business, and now health care. What is it, 20 percent of all of American business? And we're going to have this commissioner, we're going to take another 20 percent the government's going to run?

□ 2000

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield for just a moment.

Mr. AKIN. I would yield.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You know, think about it. If the President believes that he can decide who should run General Motors, which is a decision that he made in which he forced the replacement of the president of General Motors, then taking the next step and telling each of us what kind of health care we're going to have, what treatments we can have, what procedures we can have, and how much the government is going to pay for each one of those is fully within the realm of possibility, which is exactly where this bill goes.

Mr. SHADEGG. I guess what the gentleman is saying is that, if the bill passes, we'd better hope the commissioner is as smart as Peter Orszag.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. AKIN. I promised Dr. BROUN that we would give him a chance here. We're getting close to closing.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate it.

In noting what Mr. HOEKSTRA is talking about and in going back to what Mr. SHADEGG was talking about, I want to point out the reason there is such a difference in the survival rates for these two cancers. The American people need to look at it. It's not just because we're Americans. It's because, in those systems, people are put on waiting lists, as your prior chart noted, Mr. SHADEGG. It is also because the government system won't pay for the new procedures, for the new medications. So it's because of delayed treatments, of delayed evaluations of lumps in a breast, because of delayed or denied services. That's going to come under this plan that the Democrats have proposed today. It's coming to every single American. That's the reason the survival rates are so much lower for prostate cancer and breast cancer. The thing is, and what's going to happen is, our survival rates are going to actually go down and match some of those others. The American people need to understand that. If I can speak to them, that's one thing that I would say. The delayed treatment and denied treatment is going to wind up killing people. That's what this plan is going to do. It's literally going to kill people.

Mr. SHADEGG. The man is dead right.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I would like to introduce another gentleman here who has been joining us at a number of key points and junctures,

Congressman SCALISE from Louisiana. I would appreciate your jumping into the conversation here for just a minute or two.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri and all of my colleagues who have been talking tonight.

As we start to see the plan unveiled and, literally, some of the secrecy removed on this plan, I think what most American people are going to see over the next few weeks is the fact that this is nothing short of a government takeover of our health care system, a system that right now provides some of the best medical care in the world because some of those people come from those countries—from those very countries that do have government-run health care and the rationing that exists in those countries—to this country, if they have the means, because we have the best medical care even though it's a system with flaws and even though it's a system that needs some reforms. Though, the reforms that need to be made need to be made while working with all of us, with all of us here—with the doctors who have been presenting these ideas and these good solutions that have been presented—not by a government takeover that literally would ration care for American families and that would add hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes on the backs of small business owners and families across this country. That's what their bill does. That's why we've got a big difference between how we here, who have been talking tonight, would approach this solution versus this government-run takeover of our health care system.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I thank the gentleman.

That's a great summary, and I appreciate your perspective from Louisiana. I think a lot of other people are seeing it this way, particularly the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman HOEKSTRA, with all of those—and he kept reading that word "shall," "shall," "shall," "shall." This doesn't look like any kind of free enterprise to me.

I would like to recognize the doctor from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY. I thought you said you wanted to do about a minute or so before we call it here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank this gentleman from Missouri for yielding. I know time is running short.

I just wanted to point out, in regard to the government plan, the Blue Dogs, who sent this letter last Friday to Ms. PELOSI and to the majority leader, Mr. HOYER. It reads: Providers in the government plan must be fairly reimbursed at negotiated rates, and their participation must be voluntary.

The bill that was introduced today by Ms. PELOSI, in regard to providers forced to participate, reads: Establishment of a provider network for the government plan. Health care providers participating under Medicare are automatically participating providers in

the public health insurance option unless they opt out in a process established by the Secretary.

So, in talking about the powers of the commissioner, I also worry about the powers of the Secretary, and every doctor in America should worry about that.

I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. I think that, perhaps, may be the Democrats' biggest nightmare—the fact, if we have time to read the bill, that the people will see that what is promised and what the bill says are two different things. That is certainly what we're dealing with here. You have the Blue Dogs. These are Democrats. They're asking their leadership to have this flexibility, and the bill goes the exact opposite of what they're saying.

I would yield to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman HOEKSTRA.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What we're really seeing here is a continued erosion of the rights of individuals and the rights of States. Michigan is a donor State in terms of transportation. What does that mean? It means, since the inception of the national highway or the national gas tax, for every dollar that Michigan has sent to Washington, we've received 83 cents back. That hardly seems fair to me, especially when we're now number one in unemployment. Think of it. When we get that money back, the Federal Government tells us how to spend it. The same thing happened with education. We sent money here.

Think about what's going to happen with health care. It's going to come here to Washington, and we're going to apportion it back to the States. Some States are going to do better than others, and it's not going to be based on population or those types of things. It's going to be based on the power of the people in this Chamber and in the Chamber down the hall as to who has got the most influence. There are going to be donor States and—what are they?—donees or beneficiaries, the ones who get more than the rest of us.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Recipients.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Recipients.

That's no way to run a health care system. We will lose freedom, and this place will become the center of distributing money and of distributing power back to groups around the country. This is what we're fighting for. We're fighting for freedom for individuals and for sovereignty back to the States.

Mr. AKIN. You know, I really appreciate your summary, and we're getting close in time. A number of you have come to this same basic position. What we're really talking about here is freedom, isn't it? It's a subject of freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AKIN. Okay. I'll finish up and reclaim some time. Go ahead.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3170, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. ARCURI (during the Special Order of Mr. AKIN), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–208) on the resolution (H. Res. 644) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3183, ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. ARCURI (during the Special Order of Mr. AKIN), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–209) on the resolution (H. Res. 645) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the Speaker for recognizing me to address this.

While we have so many stellar experts here on health care, health insurance and on the destiny of America with regard to this large percentage of our gross domestic product, I'd ask for any of you who are willing to stay here and to continue imparting the knowledge base that you have to continue in this seamless transition over into the second hour of the Special Orders here.

It turns out that the Democrats don't have enough confidence to show up here on the floor to defend their position nor to rebut ours, and so I would point out something that I would add into this equation.

That is that, first, we have the most successful health care system in the world, and it has produced the best results in the world. Even though we have a Secretary of Agriculture who, as the lead person on health care, said that Cuba had the model for the world. No, it's the United States of America. She got the right hemisphere, and she was close to the right continent, but it's the United States of America.

I'd point out also that, by the time you reduce down the numbers of the uninsured, that 44–47 million, which is a number that is arguable, and by the time you take out of that those who are illegal and by the time you take out of that those who are in transition

between health insurance policies and by the time you just boil it down to the chronically uninsured—and this is according to a study done by two professors at Penn State University that was reproduced by the Heritage Foundation—it comes back to about 4 percent of this population that is chronically uninsured. Yet we would upset the entire system of health care in America to try to reduce that 4 percent number down to—what?—3 percent or 2 percent or not even 1 percent in their wildest aspirations.

So, rather than my venting myself completely on the things that I have in my head and heart on this health insurance and health care program, I am looking at a series of established experts.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Missouri to pick up where he left off before the clock ticked out on that first hour.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Congressman KING. I appreciate your love for free enterprise and for your willingness to stand up for freedom.

We've been joined here over the last hour by a number of distinguished doctors, by doctors who have given a large portion of their lives to providing good quality health care—by Dr. ROE from Tennessee, by Dr. GINGREY from Georgia, who just left, and by Dr. BROWN from Georgia. They all, of course, know health care far better than a lot of us because they've lived it for 30 or 40 years of their lives; but there's something that I've lived for about 9 years of my life, and that's what is called cancer.

People in America, when you hear the word “cancer”—they call it “the big C”—you pay attention to it. When I got here as a freshman Congressman, I waltzed down to the doctor's clinic that's provided by the Navy in this Capitol building. I felt bulletproof and fit as a fiddle at barely over 50. They said, Yeah, you're in pretty good shape except for one little detail: you've got prostate cancer. So, when you hear the words “the big C”—cancer—pay attention to it. So, although I'm not a doctor, I've had some experience.

There was one set of numbers that jumped out at me that we really didn't talk about, although it was mentioned by the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman SHADEGG. He talked about prostate cancer and breast cancer, but let's generalize those numbers a little bit more. Let's talk about survival rates. What we're talking about here is that, for the sake of 4 percent of the people who are chronically uninsured, the Democrats want to remake the best health care system in the world even though they were throwing rocks at it an hour and a half ago. Nobody goes from America to get health care somewhere else. They all come here to get their health care. Now what they want to do is turn us into something like Canada or England or Tennessee, which had a bad experience, or like Massachusetts.

Let's take a look at their track records before we jump too fast off this cliff. Let's take a look at the survival rates of cancer among men. In the United States, there is a 62.9 percent survival rate. That says, if you get diagnosed, there is a 62.9 percent survival rate.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. Let me just get to the other one.

Look at this one in the U.K.—that's your socialized medicine: 44.8. You're talking an 18 percent difference in the survival rates between these two systems. We want to move from the U.S. system to be more like Canada or the U.K.?

I will yield, and I have to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will reclaim my time, and will yield to the gentleman, to the doctor from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you.

I just wanted to clarify this for all of us here in the House tonight, plus for the people who are watching on C-SPAN. This includes all cancers; is that correct?

Mr. AKIN. That's my understanding. These numbers here are the survival rates of all cancers among men and of all cancers among women. Now, as you know, Doctor, prostate is the most common among men and breast cancer for women, but this is the whole deal.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. That includes lung cancer; it includes stomach cancer or pancreatic cancer or muscle cancers, bone cancers, blood cancers, et cetera. That should be astonishing to the American public to look at those values. Please tell us about—

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am happy to yield, but let me pose a question as you expand upon that thought.

If you are a man, are you better off or, if you are a woman, are you better off if you live in the United Kingdom versus the United States of America when it comes to cancer diagnoses?

Mr. AKIN. It's hard for everybody to be able to see the chart here. Regarding the cancer for women, you're at 66.3 percent survival. You're better off if you are a woman in the United States than if you are a man in the United States; but if you go to the U.K., women are still 14 percent worse in terms of cancer. So, in other words, if you're a man in England, you're really in trouble. That's the worst you can be is a guy in England—okay?—with cancer.

□ 2015

But if you are a woman in England with cancer, you're still at a 14 percent worse condition for survival rates than if you're in the United States. So, in other words, it's 18 percent worse in England for a cancer patient than it is in the United States.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield, I pose this question: If you are a woman in the United Kingdom, are you worse off than a man in the

United States? And vice versa. I will yield.

Mr. AKIN. No. If you are a woman in the United Kingdom, you have got a 52 percent. So you are a little better off than a man in the United Kingdom, but not as good as a man in the United States at 62 percent.

Mr. KING of Iowa. It is an inappropriate comparison to compare across gender when it comes to cancer because there are different survival rates because of different types of cancer.

Mr. AKIN. But still the point of these numbers is that this government-run health care system is not producing results. It's doing just what our doctors are telling us is happening, and that is, that you have all of these mandates in the government that are making it so that it can't be effective. Of course the place where most of us, when you get to be my age—there are a few old geezers here, like me. And what do you do when you get a government that can't afford to pay for the health care? Well, they start to ration care. And who are they going to ration it to? It's the older people. They are going to say, Yes, it's fine, but you don't qualify for this kind of care. You're not enough of a benefit to society. We're going to cut you off.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I happen to have had a World War II survivor and veteran hand me a whole stack of Collier's magazines that came from 1948 and 1949. It was a fascinating thing to read through the yellowing pages of those magazines where they had gone in and written these—I want to call them cameo articles on the emerging National Health Care Act of the United Kingdom, 1948 and 1949. I remember in the same magazines there was a picture of a GI sitting at the square in Berlin by Otto von Bismarck's victory statue, which was in the background of Obama's speech there when he was in the campaign. He was sitting there among the shattered trees with his helmet off, eating some K rations in that same magazine. So we're back to just post-World War II when the United Kingdom decided that because of the insecurities—and they didn't know if their economy was going to collapse. It had been so burdened because of World War II—that they would provide this National Health Care Act to supposedly fix their economy with the same psychology that President Obama has today. We're in this economic crisis, and magically the crisis that happened after the election brought about the necessity to provide the same solutions they advocated before the crisis. In any case, the United Kingdom, they then established the National Health Care Act. As I read through that, month after month, story after story, cameo appearance after appearance, the same problems that we have today were the problems they had within the first year of establishing that National Health Care Act in the United Kingdom. Long lines, rationed care, doctors and nurses

and providers whose compensation had been ratcheted down by the government from the necessity then of increasing their volume to make up for the difference in their compensation. Increasing their volume, yet they spent less time per patient, which meant that they were less able to diagnose and care for their patients, which brought down the quality of the care and the threat of the rationing that came then was manifested very shortly thereafter. I intended to go to the gentleman from Arizona, but I see the gentleman from Michigan has something to add. I yield.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I'm listening to your description of the bureaucracy in the U.K. and those kinds of things. I have just been paging through this bill. I think we all know—I think it was last week—that the majority leader said something like, "If we had to depend on the people who read the bill to vote for it, we wouldn't have very many votes." The first time that I saw this bill was about 15 minutes ago, and I'm just kind of paging through.

Mr. SHADEGG. The quote by the majority leader is, "If every Member pledged to not vote for it if they hadn't read it in its entirety, I think we would have very few votes." So he apparently thinks we shouldn't read the bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let me just read a couple of things. Here is a paragraph. I will just open it up. Before we went through, The commissioner shall, shall, shall. And we said, Okay, he shall do everything, and there is not going to be anything left.

Listen to this paragraph: "Change in the income as a percentage of FPL. In the case that an individual's income expressed as a percentage of the Federal poverty level for a family of the size involved for a plan year is expected in a manner specified by the commissioner to be significantly different from the income as so expressed used under subsection A, the commissioner shall establish rules requiring an individual to report consistent with the mechanism established under paragraph two significant changes in such income, including a significant change in family composition to the commissioner and requiring the substitution of such income for the income otherwise applicable."

Mr. SHADEGG. Excuse me? Say what?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Think of how many bureaucrats it is going to take to interpret that paragraph.

Mr. AKIN. How many bureaucrats can dance on the head of the pin, huh?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Then they're going to do ethics standards, accountability performance programs and all of these things, Federal bureaucrats. And guess what—the same people who wrote this bill, also their last bill that they wrote was No Child Left Behind because it says that as they collect this information, the Secretary shall identify organizations that are enrolled in the program that have failed to significantly

improve. Does that sound like No Child Left Behind, like we have in the Department of Education? What do we have? We have people in the Department of Education who don't read anything, who don't know the schools in Ludington, Michigan, or Detroit or Saginaw or Ann Arbor, Michigan; and they're identifying them as failing schools. Now the Federal Government is going to go through the process of identifying failing hospitals, failing nursing homes and failing those if they don't meet Federal requirements; and it's going to take a lot more bureaucrats. But I think we ought to challenge the American people. Members of Congress may not read it, but they ought to read this thing and see if they understand whether this is going to improve their health care or make it worse. I think they will become ill reading this bill.

Mr. AKIN. Is there a medicine to treat nausea?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I just would suggest that of all of the 32 czars—do we have a czar that deals with this, the failing czar? What about the failing czar?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, I think they have recognized that a czar is not a very popular word. The czar in this bill is called a commissioner. So I guess when you get to the 33rd—I guess we can only have 32 czars. Now we are starting to create commissioners, and we'll probably have 32 commissioners. Then we will have what, grand leaders after that? But I think we've topped out on czars.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I happen to remember that the aftermath of the czars was actually the Marxism that arrived with the Leninism in that period of time and, yes, the commissioners and the lists of those people. Language makes all the difference. But I would like to know how they identify the failing czar or the failing commissioner.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, it's identified in here how you will identify the failing czar and with the corresponding rules and regulations that go with this that I'm sure will be written in plain English because this is not.

Mr. KING of Iowa. This is a lot of pages of gobbledygook. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) who can add some clarity to this issue.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have done a pretty good job of filleting what I think needs to be filleted.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield for a second, with the manufacturing of all of this paper to print this bill, as a member of the Energy Committee, would this still be qualified under cap-and-trade? Or is this a violation of cap-and-trade?

Mr. SHADEGG. That actually is woody biomass, and there are certain rules of how it gets converted into energy in cap-and-trade.

Mr. SCALISE. It has got a heavy carbon footprint.

Mr. SHADEGG. I would like to, for just a moment, get serious. I think we have done a good job here.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Excuse me. I was serious.

Mr. SHADEGG. I know. But I mean deadly serious about an alternative. We get accused of being the party of no, and I hate to repeat that charge. But if I were sitting at home tonight, I would watch this; and I would say, Well, all those Republicans are saying that that 1,100 pages doesn't make sense. And I have to compliment my colleague from Michigan. He has done a stupendous job of reading some of the absurdity in that bill. So you are home and saying, Well, you Republicans are just against everything. I want to point out that that is not the case because that bill—hold it up, Mr. HOEKSTRA, if you would—that bill is not the only health care bill that was introduced in this body today. Now I will admit that the other one that was introduced in this body today is stunningly shortened. It's a fraction of that number of pages. But several of the Members in this discussion tonight were cosponsors of the bill I introduced today called the Improving Health Care For All Americans Act. It's a simplified bill. It doesn't do a top-down command-and-control government edict, all the things that Mr. HOEKSTRA was reading. What it says is, we need bottom-up reform. We need to empower individual Americans. So let me just take a quick minute to walk through five major concepts in the Improving Health Care For All Americans Act, introduced by a group of Republicans today, and tell you how it's different than what the Democrats want to do. First, we pointed out that the President keeps saying, If you like it, you can keep it. But we have pointed out that the wording of their bill says, If you like it, you will lose it, because it says that in 5 years, every bill that exists today will be gone because it has to meet the standards written by a new commission. Well, our bill, the Republican bill, Improving Health Care For All Americans Act says, If you like it, you can keep it. Of the 83 percent of Americans who say they are happy with their health care right now, most of those people get their health care from their employers. Our bill says, If you have employer-provided health care and you like it, you—the patient, the employee—get to choose to keep it. And if they choose to keep it, they keep their current tax exclusion. Many Democrats want to take that tax exclusion away. However, we will not force you to give up your health care. We really mean, If you like it, you can keep it. That is what is in our bill. Second, every American under our bill gets choice, and every American gets coverage. How do we do that? The bill says, If you have employer-provided coverage and you like it, you keep it. But what about people that don't have employer-provided coverage? Our bill

says, We are going to give you the right to use your tax dollars if you pay income taxes to buy a policy that you choose; and if you buy a policy of your choice and you spend \$2,500 as an individual or \$5,000 as a family, you get a dollar-for-dollar tax offset. So those people get to buy a policy they like, and they can keep it. What about the Americans that many people are concerned about, those who don't pay income taxes? Our bill gives them a tax stipend and says, Here, we're going to provide you the funds to go buy a plan of your choice. Now that covers every single American, everyone who has employer-provided coverage and likes it; everyone who doesn't have employer-provided coverage; everyone who has employer-provided coverage but doesn't like it; and everyone who can't afford to go out and buy it on their own, we cover every single American. But you know what, we didn't put one of them, not one of them into a government program. Now why didn't we do that? Well, the Democrats say, Let's let the rich people buy their own insurance and put the poor into government programs. That's what we're doing now with SCHIP and Medicaid. We say, Why not give those who can't afford their own coverage a cash stipend to buy a plan they like? Why shouldn't they have control over their lives and their health care and make it respond to them and their demands? So our bill does that.

Now you say—and this happened in the last Presidential debate—Well, you're going to force everybody into the individual market and costs are much higher in the individual market. Dead wrong. Our bill provides new pooling mechanisms and group plan choices for every single American. This is a kind of a different concept. Right now everybody in America that wants to get into an insurance pool to pool their risk with other people, you know how many pools they can possibly join? One. Their employer's pool. That's the only pool you and I are offered. Every single one of us on the floor here is offered, as Congressmen, the chance to join our employer's pool. Can we join some other pool? No, we can't. This bill says, We're going to let many pools be formed. We're going to let social organizations, we're going to let civic organizations, we're going to let—for example, for me, the University of Arizona Alumni Association might form a pool and offer a plan. For someone who's a member of the Kiwanis International, we'll let the Kiwanis Clubs International form a pool. How about the Daughters of the American Revolution? Why shouldn't they be able to form a pool? We can have lots of different pools so that you and I can choose—I want to be in my employer's pool and have a low-cost plan; or I want to be in the Kiwanis International pool or the AARP pool or some other kind of pool where my risk is pooled with others. That's the third piece of our bill.

And now the one that many Democrats are concerned about—and it is one of the ones where I think we agree with them—and that is pre-existing conditions and chronic conditions. Those price lots of people out of the ability to buy health care. Do Republicans care about that? Yes. Are we going to force you into something? Are we going to pass a mandate like the Democrats' mandate? No. What our bill says is that every single American with a pre-existing condition or a chronic condition whose health care costs get so high they either can't find a policy or can't afford the policy will be able to join a high-risk pool or a reinsurance plan, a reinsurance mechanism that holds down the cost of their health care to the cost of everyone else's even though they have a pre-existing.

□ 2030

I mentioned this earlier. I have an older sister who is a breast cancer survivor—thank God she's a survivor—for over 20 years. For years, she was forced to keep her teaching job even if she wanted to change jobs because she had a preexisting condition. Her cancer was covered as long as she stayed with her employer, but if she left, her cancer wasn't covered.

Under our bill, her cancer would have been covered even if she changed jobs.

We can control costs in America by empowering patients and consumers. We can reform American health care from the bottom up, not command and control from the top down.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Can I reclaim my time before we yield over to Georgia?

I would like to know what that fifth point is. I think I have four down.

Mr. SHADEGG. The fifth point was empowering consumers by giving them the right to buy and control their own health care. That is, if you are an employee, if you have a plan offered by an employer, you can choose to keep it or choose to take the tax credit and buy another plan. And empowering everyone else that doesn't have an employer-provided plan, that empowering of you and I to take control of our health care back will let us shop for the best quality care at the lowest price, which we can't do right now. Right now it's a third-party system. Your employer picks your plan and your plan picks your doctor.

The Democrats say that is a terrible, failed system. We should take the employer out and put the government in. How does that make it any better? What we say is empower individual Americans. Give them the ability to make their health care choices and, oh, by the way, they will then not only have power and control and can fire a plan that doesn't work for them, but they will also have a greater stake and an interest in their own health care.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would add that the central philosophy here is the difference between

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives: our understanding of human nature and what inspires human nature and the things that fail to inspire human nature. They believe they can create a managed economy, a utopia that's managed by smart liberals on top who are taking care of those people who can't take care of themselves.

We believe that the markets drive the best decisions. It's the difference between free enterprise and central command. And it's a philosophy that's been laid out here from Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. It's their idea of a Washington-centered plan. Their 1,100-page bill is all Washington-centered. It's got a commissioner. If it doesn't have a czar, it's got a powerful commissioner. Or our idea of a patient-centered plan.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Driven by the best of human nature.

And I yield to the gentleman from Georgia and then to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I want to applaud the gentleman from Arizona's efforts to put this plan together.

I want to point out something. We, as Republicans, are accused of being the "Party of No" by the folks on the other side, the Democrats. But I want to—if I could tell the American people this—I can't in the rules of the House—but the Republican Party is actually the Party of Know—K-N-O-W. We know how to fix things, and I congratulate Mr. SHADEGG for putting together an alternative to present to the American public.

I'm working on one in my office also that's a little different from Mr. SHADEGG's, and there are other plans being developed on the Republican side. We know how to fix it and to look to the free enterprise system to fix things and not look to socialism, which is what our colleagues on the Democrat side look to. They look to socialism, they look to central command, they look to a Washington bureaucrat to tell us how to run not only health care, but I want to also indicate we have had plans about a lot of things.

We had an energy plan. The American Energy Act that I was a cosponsor of—and I think probably every one of us here tonight were cosponsors—that would have made America energy independent. We've developed on our Republican side plans to stimulate the economy by cutting taxes on small business and creating real jobs.

The Democrats' centralized plans that create a bigger Washington, more bureaucracy has not worked. Where are the jobs? But we had a plan on the Republican side that would have actually created jobs.

And over and over again, the Democrats that claimed that we are the Party of No, N-O, will only allow their plan to be presented to see the light of day here in this House. That's dictatorship, in my opinion.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. We are the Party of Know, K-N-O-W.

Mr. SHADEGG. Not only do we know how to fix things, but we are the Party of Know in another way.

I want—every one of us here tonight, every Republican in this Congress wants the American people to know—k-n-o-w—what's in this bill before we pass it. We are being told that we have to rush to pass this in less than 3 weeks.

The first markup of this bill will occur, I believe, on Thursday. It will not conclude until the following Wednesday. We then have less than a week and a half from that until the August break. The Democrats apparently don't want Americans to know, k-n-o-w, what's in this bill. I think we are the party of know, k-n-o-w. I want the American people to know when you consider this as 20 percent of our economy—it's one in every six jobs—it's shocking that we would consider passing such a bill without knowing what's in it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I think it's clear that if this bill sits out there over the August break until after Labor Day, they understand the American people will rise up against it.

And I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I appreciate the comments from my friend from Arizona and his alternative bill. I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee as well. We're going to have a heated debate, a very necessary and important debate. But this should be a debate that allows all of these different ideas and facts to come out.

But there is an old adage that says if you don't learn from the mistakes of history, you are doomed to repeat it. So I think if you go back to January and review the last 6 months and you look at the mistakes that have been made along the way and transpose that to the bill that was filed today, this government takeover of our health care system, you'll see a lot of similarities to the previous mistakes that's been made up until this point.

When the President came in in January, his first initiative was this massive so-called stimulus bill: \$787 billion in spending, borrowed money that we don't have, money that's going to be borrowed against our future, China and other countries that will be loaning us this money. This bill was touted as a way to save the economy.

The President said we need to do this or else unemployment will reach 8 percent. Today as we stand here and review that bill, as my friend from Georgia said, where are the jobs? We know it hasn't created jobs. In fact, since President Obama took office, two million more Americans have lost their jobs. In the meantime, the stimulus

bill is starting to have effects on the economy, but now you are beginning to see the beginnings of inflation because of all of this borrowing.

You are also seeing the fact that this bill is clearly not working—not only all of us who voted against the bill and proposed an alternative, and the President who vowed to be so bipartisan would not work with any Republicans to take some of the ideas that we had, ideas to actually empower Americans, to allow small businesses to hire people, to give tax relief to small businesses and families that are struggling out there. The President didn't want to approach any of those ideas. He just wanted this one-size-fits-all government-run program, spend more money, \$800 billion.

And now just last week his own Vice President said this plan, they misread the economy. And the President himself is going around saying—first he's saying that he wouldn't do anything differently on the stimulus bill and he said the stimulus bill is working according to plan.

Now, I'm not sure what plan he had, but two million more people out of work from the day he took office, unemployment approaching 10 percent, and he said that's the plan that's working.

Mr. SHADEGG. He said what?

Mr. SCALISE. He said he wouldn't do anything differently and the stimulus bill was working according to plan.

Mr. SHADEGG. He was planning on 9.5 percent unemployment?

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly he must have been because he and his own Vice President not only are saying that that bill, the stimulus bill, is working according to plan but they're saying on the other end, some people in the White House are saying they're so concerned now about the economy and the approaching 10 percent unemployment that they're talking about doing a second stimulus.

So people who are admitting on one hand they misread the economy, everyone's acknowledged that their stimulus plan isn't working and is spending money we don't have.

Then they're talking about doing another stimulus bill to spend even more money we don't have.

Mr. AKIN. I need to interrupt. I am so hopelessly confused. I really need some help from my colleagues tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I'm not ready to endorse that statement that's been made by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. I remember we were promised if we don't pass the stimulus bill, we're going to see unemployment over 8 percent. And so, of course, we didn't vote for it. But they passed the stimulus bill, and now we've got 9.5, or whatever it is percent, unemployment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. It's 14 percent in many of my counties in the 10th Congressional District in Georgia.

Mr. AKIN. This is part of the plan. By golly, it just seems like to me maybe we shouldn't have passed that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If I could reclaim my time before I yield back.

I want to point out this 9.5 unemployment rate, it equates into real people. That's 14½ million that are unemployed; and when you add then to those who are looking for a job that have exhausted their unemployment benefits, you've got another 6.8 or 6.9 million. You round that down to 20 million people looking for a job in America, and that's the stimulus plan.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Your 20 million people are the number of people almost that don't have health insurance. So now we've created 20 million unemployed through this wonder of economics, this Keynesian economics that supposedly says the government goes on a spending spree, everybody is going to be doing great.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Twenty million that are uninsured. By the time you take it down to the chronically uninsured, according to a Penn State study by a couple of professors at Penn State, that's 10.1 million chronically uninsured, and that equates to a little bit less than 4 percent of the population of the United States of America. That's what we've got.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. This health care bill is going to put more people out of work. More people are going to be unemployed. And it's going to hurt the economy even more, which is going to mean more cost to the American taxpayers. So taxes are going to go up and the cost of health care is going to skyrocket.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But if the gentleman from Georgia—reclaiming my time, and I would pose the question back to the panel that's here of the experts. This was President Obama's economic development plan. This economic crisis that we're in commands that we establish a socialized medicine program. So the gentleman who's lived for that—or excuse me, the gentleman who's lived with that in Tennessee—the doctor from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, if you could tell us what you learned in Tennessee with the plan that was similar to that that Obama has proposed.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. We have been over that previously.

But a couple of things I wanted to bring out.

This is from the CBO this afternoon that scored this bill that we're looking at here. It's 1,000-plus pages. After we have this monstrous government takeover in 10 years, we still have 17 million people uninsured. And, I mean, it's astonishing to me that we would look at a bill like this and still have almost half the people uninsured with the government then making health care decisions.

One of the things we were talking about, cancer a moment ago, and I think what we want to say is—and I think the gentleman from Arizona has hit it right on the head—you need to have patients in charge of health care decisions.

When I began my practice in the early 1970s and in the late 1960s when I was a medical student, 80 percent of children who went to St. Jude Children's Hospital died of their childhood cancer. Eighty percent died. Today over 80 percent live. It's really a phenomenal story to tell a parent. Almost all children with leukemia have lived now. It's unbelievable. And that's happened in the last 35 or 40 years.

When I began my medical practice almost half the women who came to me with breast cancer—and we saw too many of those—died within 5 years. Survival rates now are in the high 90s. It's astonishing. It's a wonderful story.

When the patient comes in, they're frightened, and you have already mentioned how scary that was when you are diagnosed with cancer. But to know that you are going to get through it, that's what this phenomenal health care system in America has produced.

And what is amazing to me is that we're going to have this bill that's a thousand-plus—well, that's the start of it. It will still leave that many people uninsured. And we have heard right here tonight a better way to do it, a much simpler way from the ground up.

And let me give you one other example. It's very simple. In my own medical practice back in Tennessee, we have 290-something people who get health insurance through our practice. We have two plans we offer them. One is just your standard Blue Cross plan, 80-20, we all are familiar with. The other is a health savings account, high deductible plan where you have the first \$5,000 out of pocket. You pay for that. We put \$4,200 away for that.

□ 2045

Everything above \$5,000 is paid 100 percent. Eighty-four percent of the people in that practice, nurses, technicians, whatever, chose to manage their own health care dollars, not the insurance company but them. They will lose that ability with this particular plan, and I think that was a plan right now that I use and that people all over the country want to be in charge of their health care decisions, not the government.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Tennessee, I am watching the gentleman from Michigan reading through his thousand-plus-pages bill here, with his exemplary model of concentration in the middle of all this. I think you could do this under fire.

What have you learned since the last time you imparted some knowledge? And I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is an amazing bill. We've talked about the creation of this commissioner who will have the power to implement much of what is in here. You start reading it and you really can't understand it because it's not written in plain English; although, in the bill,

there's a requirement that stuff be written in plain English. And then you start getting into the penalties and the fines and the payments for people who don't meet certain regulations or certain requirements.

I haven't gotten to the tax part yet, but as I've been briefed on this program throughout the day, I think we all recognize that this massive new free health care from the government is not going to be free. It's going to cost us a lot of money.

There's a lot of stuff in here about the authorities of the IRS and what the IRS can do, and then you start getting in here and, you know, you start reading what services are included, which ones are excluded and those types of things. And what you recognize is we're going to see the same thing on this bill that we saw on cap-and-trade.

Remember what happened on cap-and-trade? There was a 900-page bill that passed out of your committee and, you know, late Thursday night, early Friday morning, when they didn't have the votes—

Mr. SHADEGG. 3:09 in the morning.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. At 3:09 in the morning, they added about this many more pages to the bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. 316 pages.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. 316 pages to get to 219 votes, and nobody knew what was in it, and you're going to see the same thing here.

This bill cannot get 218 votes because this bill will be out there for the American people to read for the next couple of weeks, but don't worry, the night before it will be changed and there will be 400 new pages at least buying off Members' votes to get something into this bill to get to 219. And that's how we're going to construct health care reform in America.

Mr. SHADEGG. I just want to say, I compliment the gentleman, and he asked me to go get this information and I've gotten it.

For any American who wants to read the bill as it exists tonight, which as my colleague from Michigan has just pointed out will change probably at 3:09 in the morning on the day we vote on it, you can go to the Energy and Commerce Committee Web site and download or read the bill yourself. To get there, you go to www.energycommerce—the word energy, E-N-E-R-G-Y, then with no space the word commerce, C-O-M-M-E-R-C-E—house.gov. You will then see an icon that says Quality Affordable Health Care Act. If you click on that icon, you, yourself, can download those 1,100 pages and enjoy reading it the way my colleague from Michigan has enjoyed reading it and some of the bizarre things in it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Actually, if you click on that icon, your computer will crash.

I thank my colleague for getting that information for us. Thank you.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and appreciating the facile infor-

mation that will, I think, rather than put a person to sleep, cause insomnia if anybody reads this, and I appreciate the effort to do so. It can be a selfless act of intellectual scholarly patriotism to read some of this, but I've heard enough of the gobbledygook that came out of it from Mr. HOEKSTRA's reading it, the requirement that it be and required to be in plain English catches me a little bit off balance, having heard the language that's in the bill, not having read it.

And I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. I think that we've had chance a little bit to take a look, and I think in a constructive way to, lampoon this method of doing business. We already saw the 1,100- or 1,200- or 1,400-page bill and then 300 pages of amendments at 3 o'clock in the morning, all this kind of gobbledygook, and the equivalent of a czar to take over 20 percent of our economy, which is health care. And yet, the fact of the matter is those of us standing here—and we can do this a little bit with a sense of humor, almost crying at the same time—know that there are some very plain English principles which we have all seen that make health care work, things that we all stand for and believe in.

We believe in the fact that there should be a relationship between a doctor and a patient, and the bureaucrat shouldn't get in the way. I think an awful lot of Americans believe in that, too. I think that those of us standing in this Chamber tonight believe in the fact that we don't want some government bureaucrat rationing our health care and telling us that we're too old and that it is too expensive for us. We would rather have a competitive system and let us see what we can buy with our own dollars rather than having a bureaucrat rationing our health care.

There are other things that we believe in. The gentleman has introduced another bill that he didn't talk about tonight, my good friend from Arizona, and that's a bill that says that you can go shopping for health care. And what it does is it prevents any health care provider from cornering some section of the market. It says you can go buy your health care from across State lines. If an insurance provider wants to allow you to buy the insurance, you can go to a different place to get that. So we create legitimate competition in the marketplace.

What we have always stood for is freedom, and what is being proposed here is the same rubber-stamped baloney that we have seen all the last 6 months. It is more taxes and more bureaucracy. The solution to every problem to a liberal is more taxes and more bureaucracy. The only thing is it is escalating. This is \$1.5 trillion worth of taxes that's going to be required to make this work, and there's no idea anybody has of how they are going to come up with that. There goes more deficit.

There are plain English things that make health care work, and to try to destroy the best health care system in the world with this bureaucratic stuff is a travesty. It's really wrong.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, when the gentleman refers to plain English principles, you aren't talking about the United Kingdom principles of a national health care act. You're talking about the things we understand in the language which we refer to as the plain English language that we all should understand, and I would yield back to the gentleman for a response to that clarification.

Mr. AKIN. Well, that's right, and what we're talking about here, though, is if you get it done late enough at night and nobody has a chance to read it, you can sneak it by. And that's not a principle that Americans should be proud of. We heard an awful lot about transparency, but we've seen none of transparency. All we've seen is dark-of-the-night, backroom deals, and more taxes, more regulations, more bureaucracy, and this one threatens the lives and livelihoods of our constituents.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, there's a philosophy here again, this dividing philosophy between the people that are right on the right side of the political spectrum and the people that are wrong on the left side of the political spectrum.

And I remember when the wall went down on November 9, 1989. The Iron Curtain came crashing down, and it came crashing down because free enterprise trumped central planning in the 5-year plan. And the difference is because we're in the business of seeking to enhance and improve the overall annual average productivity of every American. If we do that, our economy thrives, and when our economy thrives, our quality of life goes up in proportion to the way our economy thrives. That's the part of human nature that is at the core of the difference in this philosophy.

And they, the people who don't show up down here to carry on this debate because they cannot carry out this debate in the face of the logic and the plain English that they're faced with, they believe in central planning. They believe they can put together a plan and a model and the inside that will tell everybody what to do at every moment. And there will be a rule written and a law written and some contingency plan for everything that might go wrong, and somehow they can put together the master utopian formula that's going to improve and strengthen—actually, the plan is to strengthen them politically, not to improve the lives in America so much.

But their idea has failed because they don't believe in human nature being competitive, and they don't believe that there's goodness in the heart of all of us as well as evil in the heart of all of us. We legislate against the evil and we enhance the goodness. They just simply say the reason people don't succeed is because conservatives got in

their way, and that's the cynical approach.

I yield first to the gentleman from Georgia and back to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to point out something in plain English, as Mr. AKIN was just doing. We hear on the House floor here over and over again that there are 45 million or 47 million people that don't have health care in this country. That's false. It's a blatant falsehood that's being perpetuated on the floor of this House. Everybody in this country has access to health care. The question is where do they get it, who pays for it, and at what cost.

The reason everybody in this country has access to health care is because they walk into any emergency room in this country, and under Federal law, the emergency room doctor, the emergency room has to evaluate and essentially treat everybody who walks in. That's the reason if you walk into an emergency room in Augusta, Georgia, or Athens, or Elberton or anyplace in my district, you will see the emergency room filled with illegal aliens who are going there. The taxpayers of America are paying for their health care in the hospitals, and the hospitals are getting to the point where they can't continue it but it's because of Federal law that they have to treat these illegal aliens.

So everybody has access to health care. So we are really talking about two things in this health care debate, not one. It's not monolithic. We have health care system and the provision of health care on one side, which is absolutely the very best in the world, and we have health care financing on the other hand that is broken.

And we'll all agree that health care financing is broken, but it's broken because of government and government regulation and government intrusion in the health care system. And they want to make more intrusion into the system, which is going to make it more expensive. It's going to raise taxes on everybody in this country.

It's going to raise the cost of every single good and service in this country because it's going to be mandated to all businesses, so they're going to have to charge more for their goods and services. So everything's going to go up. Our economy is going to go down.

I can see the headlines a few years from now. Headlines: Obama lied, the economy's dead. And that's a potential that we have with this health care system. And it's absolutely critical the American public understand that it is going to be extremely expensive. It's going to increase costs to everybody, and it's going to raise taxes on small business so people are going to be put out of work because of this plan that's being introduced today.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and it references me to the health care providers that have

dropped out, gone out of business or failed to expand or diminished their operations because of having to provide free health care to, let me say, free health care to illegals.

And I'm thinking of the gentleman from Arizona, and I think of Arizona whenever I think of losing access to health care because of having to provide free health care to illegals. At a time that I stopped down in an unannounced surprise visit at Sasabe, Arizona, at the port of entry, and there as I was talking to the shift supervisor, whose name I remember and decline to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he got a call on his cell phone. He said, Just a minute. I'm going to take care of something. I'll come back to you.

He took care of it. He came back to me in a few minutes, and he said, Well, you're going to see a Mexican ambulance come across the border, and then I've already called U.S. ambulances to come down and do the handoff, and I've called the dust off to come—he said Life Flight—to come and pick up this patient who has been knifed in a knife fight in Mexico, and this ambulance and their care won't take care of him, so we're going to do that.

So, anyway, I had a medical officer with me and I asked him to look in on this and see what you can do to save this fellow's life, and it turned out to be this. They came across the border. The ambulance had no oxygen in it, no medical equipment in it. It only had a little bit of gauze and a few surgical gloves and that was really it. So the U.S. ambulances showed up, put oxygen on him and triaged him, and we loaded him in the helicopter and flew him off. I went to visit him in the Tucson University Hospital the next day. He survived, and it cost us \$30,000.

But it caused me to sit down with the CFO, who told me that it costs them annually an average of \$14.5 million to provide health care there for illegals and that Tucson University is the most southerly trauma center in all of Arizona, and that a bus full of illegals had been wrecked near Tucson and in it were 25. Fifteen went into intensive care. Their IC unit was tied up, and so the people from Tucson that paid their premiums were taken up to Phoenix where the family had to drive up there to visit the patient.

That is what I saw. The man that represents a good chunk of Arizona knows it for a fact. I'd be happy to yield to the gentleman, Mr. SHADEGG.

□ 2100

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. And I just want to reiterate this point. Republicans are here for a cause. We believe in something. We believe in bringing down the cost of health care in America.

The President has said those costs are unsustainable—and they are. Republicans are here for the cause. Our cause is to help families and businesses get a hold of their health care costs and bring them down.

But here's how we want to do it. We want to do it through patient-centered health care. Patient-centered health care offers the best way to reduce health care costs. The old Washington, D.C.-centered, top-down approach that Democrats envision will empower bureaucrats in this city. And those bureaucrats will restrict cures, restrict treatments, and get between you and your doctor. The Washington-centered system will cost trillions more—and they admit it. That's the price tag on their bill.

The President sees the problem, but he's got the solution wrong. They want a Washington-centered plan. We want a patient-centered reform. They want a Washington-centered experiment. We want simple, commonsense fixes. They want a closed health care system where Washington bureaucrats make the decisions. We want an open health care system where you and I, patients, people, average Americans get to make those decisions. We want bottom-up, empower Americans, patient-centered. They want top-down, bureaucrat-driven.

The political artificial cost reductions they talk about won't happen. If we empower a big Washington-run monopoly, it won't work. I repeat what I said before. Since when did getting the government involved, since when did having the government take over something bring down costs?

If you join us, if you believe that Americans should be empowered from the bottom up, not told what to do from the top down, then help us and don't let this plan pass. Help Republicans pass a plan, a simple plan that will help American families and American businesses.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I just think about when I listen to you talk, that's—I think—the most inspiring dialog that's flowed out in the last hour and a half or 2 hours.

I think of hundreds of millions of individual Americans who are addressing their own individual health care issues and their health insurance issues, knowing their particular problems, knowing their cash flow, knowing what the options are and making an informed decision, each one individually as an individual or a family, working in conjunction often with an employer who has a series of policies out there that can be offered, that individual intellect that's there, and having faith in the individuals, as compared to an almost one-size-fits-all plan that competes directly against the private sector and takes away that individual initiative and put us down into this thing that they would call safety net of government, which clearly has a lot of holes in it, and has in every government that's tried to produce this plan.

I'd be happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, the one who's illustrated the TennCare issue and also his professional expertise as a doctor.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is very

simply what's going to happen—what will occur in a government-run plan. First of all, I can assure you it's going to cost you two times what these estimates are. That's what happened in Tennessee with our TennCare plan.

Secondly, the way all of these plans work is they ultimately ration care. When you have a certain amount of dollars that you spend on health care and the demand is higher than the dollars to pay for it, you create waste.

Just an example. In Canada for a hip replacement it's 2 to 3 years to get your hip replaced. Bypass surgery is 117 days. Here in this country, George Washington University very near here, or Georgetown—it will be done very quickly.

So those are things that happen in a government-run plan. And who needs to be making health care decisions are families, patients, and their physicians. That's who should be making those decisions.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Are you telling me if someone actually breaks their hip in Canada, then it doesn't take 2 to 3 years?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. No, this is an elective replacement.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming, I pose this issue here, but it isn't true for all Canadians. And I say this because even though there's a law in Canada that prohibits one from jumping ahead in the line or having a policy or a plan that gives them preferential treatment, they want everybody down at the bottom.

There are provinces that don't enforce it equally. So there are places where people carve out their own special privileges so that those who are better off have an avenue to better health care, even though the law says not. But that's within the Canadians. And let them do it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield for just a minute.

Mr. KING of Iowa. But it's what happens in America. I would yield to the gentleman from Michigan. I know you're on the border.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Because the Canadians have another way to escape. They escape to the American system. Some of our busiest hospitals are those along the border. So the Canadians that have the resources and are at the bottom of the line, what they will do is they will jump the border and they will get their health care in the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I heard just recently about a patient in Canada that had such severe knee pain that he was having to take narcotics. It took him over 1 year just to go see an orthopedic surgeon.

If a patient comes to see me and has knee pain, I pick up the telephone and

call an orthopedic surgeon and I'll get them within a week or two. But it took this patient over 1 year to ever go see the orthopedic surgeon and to get the x rays that he needed to evaluate his knee pain. When he finally saw the orthopedic surgeon, the doctor said, Well, you need this surgery. And the Canadian said, Well, that's fine. Let's schedule it. He said, No, we have to put you on a waiting list.

So he came—I don't know if he came to one of your local hospitals there in Michigan—but he came to the U.S. to get his surgery done on his knee. And that's exactly what this government program is going to do to Americans. But where are we going to go if they indeed put this into place?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming your time but given to me, what this Wall Street Journal says: "Access to a waiting list is not access to health care".

Waiting lists are what I hear about all the time when I'm talking to our friends across the border. But what I hear from the medical professionals and the hospitals in Michigan is we treat the well-to-do Canadians who will come across the border and access our health care because they're unwilling to be on a waiting list. And they recognize that being on a waiting list isn't having your problem taken care of.

If you've got to wait for 117 days or 171 days—117 days for a bypass—excuse me—I think that's about 112 or 113 days too long.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. One hundred-sixteen for me.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If it's you. If it were me, I would say it's about 116 days too long. The same thing for a hip replacement and all of that. The American health care will fundamentally change if this goes into effect.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, in the brief moment that we have left I want to make the point that if the Canadians were protected by constitutional rights that we have as Americans, they would be protected, because it's cruel and inhuman to ask the Canadians to give up on their access to good health care here in the United States of America.

You can go on the Web site and you can find companies in Canada that have been formed by entrepreneurs that turnkey the package. If you need a hip replacement in Canada, you can find a tour company that will set you up and say, Here's your flight to Seattle or Detroit or wherever it might be, or maybe Houston for heart surgery. Here's the surgeon, here's the hotel, here's the transportation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We can take care of this in Michigan. We've got great doctors and hospitals who are ready, willing, and able to serve. I appreciate the leniency of the Chair to make sure that I can get this paid public announcement in for the State of Michigan.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me conclude by simply saying that this Obama care is cruel and inhuman to Canadians. And I would yield back the balance of

my time and thank my colleagues for being here.

CURRENT COUNTERPRODUCTIVE POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here on the floor of the House tonight and after hearing this fine presentation and thinking about all the things that are going on in Washington right now, I am reminded of the television series "The Twilight Zone". These days, I half expect Rod Serling to appear from behind a curtain and announce that "This is the Twilight Zone."

Well, yes, there's almost a bizarre sense of unreality here in the Nation's Capitol—the transformation of private liability into public debt on a massive scale; the unprecedented level of deficit spending, debt piled upon debt; borrowing from China in order to give foreign aid to other countries; enacting Draconian restrictions and controls on a national economy and on the lives of our people in order to stop the planet from going through a climate cycle.

What? The Earth has had so many climate cycles in the past, and now it's being used—the one we're in, which is very little different than any of the other cycles we have been in—it's being used to justify economy-killing and freedom-killing controls, taxes, and mandates, and putting power in the hands of international bodies that should be the power of the people of the United States to run their own life.

Our Nation's borders leak like a spaghetti strainer. Millions of people illegally continuing to pour into our country to consume limited health care, education, and other social service dollars. And, yes, to take jobs away from our people and, in some cases, to commit crimes against our people. Our government just lets it happen. We can't even build a darn fence.

And we have had a one-way free trade policy with China that has all but killed medium- and large-scale manufacturing in our country and which has relegated our own people to low-paying jobs and sent trillions of dollars to Communist China.

No one has even suggested a change in that obviously rotten policy if, for nothing else, just to give our economy a little boost. Instead, we begged the gangster regime that runs China to loan us even more money—money that they accumulated because of a trade policy that has been monstrously counterproductive to the long-term interests of our own people—a one-way free trade policy.

And that's not the only counterproductive policy which has brought our economy to its knees. Our people are suffering high energy prices needlessly. There are dollars being siphoned

off from our pockets and deposited in the coffers overseas—the coffers of rich foreigners. Some of these rich foreigners who are now receiving all of these dollars which we have to spend to buy energy, some of these foreigners hate us.

And while what little money we have goes to buying foreign oil, massive domestic deposits of oil and gas worth trillions of dollars are left untouched, untapped, and unused.

Off the West Coast, huge caverns of valuable oil and gas are sitting there, unused, even as California sinks into an economic abyss and public services are cut back or canceled. Trillions of dollars sent overseas for energy, while at home no new oil refineries, no hydroelectric dams, no nuclear power plants.

We are told of course, You have to rely on solar, only to find out that radical environmentalists in the name of protecting the habit of insects and lizards are blocking the building of solar plants in the desert. We can't even build an aqueduct in California because of a tiny fish—the delta smelt. So our people will suffer because of concern over a worthless little fish that's not even good enough to use as bait.

People are beginning to suffer in the Central Valley for lack of water. There's no water for the crops. There's just about enough water for them. So they don't have a job and they can't pay for food. Water prices are going up for tens of millions of Californians in southern California, taking even more money out of our pockets, further undermining our people's ability to pay for their basic essentials.

Yet, with all of this, just a few weeks ago Congress voted not to help our suffering people and move forward with water production, but to protect that damn little fish.

□ 2115

Well, then on top of it all, last year, in the name of preventing economic calamity, Congress was stampeded into giving away trillions of dollars. Much of it to—well, nobody knows really who did get all of that money. We have provided hundreds of billions to the financial industry, fat cats who have been giving themselves bonuses even as they drove their own companies into the ground. Well, I would rather spend the money on lizards than on that bunch. And here we are facing an economic crisis, and even after all of these mind-boggling giveaways, we still face the same economic crisis. And those mind-boggling giveaways of trillions of dollars, which we are now going to have to pay the interest on because it is now debt that is owed by the American people, this may well have made the situation worse and more damaging and elongated our economic hardship.

As I say, it is all a bit bizarre. But if we are to pull our country out of this, we need to mobilize and activate our people. It is time not to give up, but to buck up and to stand up. With all that

is facing us, let's not forget that Americans have an inherent resilience. We have met and overcome great challenges in our past. The fundamentals were, of course, in the right place in those days. Our people were strong and had a culture of self-reliance. Our leaders, I dare say, had more courage, common sense and even perhaps integrity than today's bunch. Our freedom was our greatest asset. It was intact, yet to be eroded by decades of Federal expansion of our government into areas that it was never meant to go.

Our Constitution was once revered. That, more than anything else, kept America on the right track, our Constitution and the rights it incorporated. One of the constitutionally protected rights that is often overlooked was key to the success of our country, helping us overcome hard times and ensuring the well-being and safety of our people. Protecting this right is essential if we are to turn around the economic decline that we are now suffering.

It is this right and the efforts being made in Congress to undermine it that is the subject of my speech tonight. That little recognized, but immensely important, fundamental right is the specific protection provided in our Constitution to America's innovators, creative citizens and free thinkers, and to every person with a new way of approaching a problem or getting the job done or making a system just a little bit more efficient.

Article I, section 8 of that great document, the U.S. Constitution, states that "Congress shall have the Power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." Significantly the word "right" only appears once in the body of the Constitution, and that is in article I, section 8, which I just read.

That word "right" was in place even before the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution, which suggests these economic rights were believed to be as vital to the future of our country as were the other rights that were protected: freedom of religion, the rights of speech and assembly.

Our technological genius and the laws consistent with the intent of the Constitution which was protecting and promoting that genius, accomplished what they were intended to accomplish. It has been America's technological edge, flowing from that fundamental legal protection, that has permitted our people to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world and allowed our people a level of opportunity, which gave common people the chance to live decent lives and to control their own destiny.

It has provided the technology needed to defeat tyranny and keep our people safe from foreign armies and terrorists. Technology and freedom go together; our Founding Fathers knew

this. It is also true of technology and prosperity. It is not just hard work that built America. People around the world work hard, and so many of those people who work so hard live in abject poverty. But when coupled with technology, and, yes, freedom, that hard work produces vast amounts of wealth, even while easing the burden on the working people themselves.

Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington and others, all of our Founding Fathers, were not only people who believed in freedom, but they were people who also believed in technology and the potential genius of the American people. By the way, Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, was also the first head of our country's patent office.

As our Founding Fathers wanted, we have had the strongest protection of patent rights of any country in the world. That is why in the history of all humankind there has never been a more innovative or creative people. It didn't just happen. It happened because our Constitution and our Founding Fathers saw to it that our law protected the ownership of one's intellectual creations.

Americans led the way in uplifting humankind's quality of life and giving average Americans the opportunity to prosper and enjoy life. Who created the American Dream? Our people who worked hard. But also our inventors who gave them the technology they needed to do their job better than ever before. That is how highly paid people were able to outcompete large numbers of lowly paid people. America's goal was to build a country where all of us, not just the elite, could have a wonderful life and could live in prosperity.

Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin. He also invented interchangeable parts for manufacturing. How did that change America? How did it change the world? Ordinary people had clothes and jobs thanks to Eli Whitney and the American Constitution that encouraged and protected his genius. Cyrus McCormick invented the reaper. Before that, farm workers had to carry heavy tools and work themselves half to death. The amount of harvest was limited, and it was all based on human strength and not the strength of the machine. With the invention of the reaper, ordinary people, farmers and laborers, had better lives and lived longer lives and stomachs that were filled with an abundance of food.

Samuel Morse invented the telegraph, tested right here in this very building, the Congress of the United States. And from it came, of course, Alexander Graham Bell's telephone. And then there was Thomas Edison who invented the light bulb, and so many other inventions that uplifted the life of ordinary people.

These were not just accidents. These creative people were able to flourish under a system of constitutional protections that were superior to any other such protections anywhere in the world.

Perhaps the epitome of the little guys who, with freedom, accomplished greatness, were the two fellows who owned a bicycle shop in Ohio, the Wright brothers. These two very ordinary Americans ended up inventing something just a little more than 100 years ago that changed the world forever. They were told 110 years ago that what they sought to create was impossible. Yet with limited resources and protected by our robust patent system, they took humankind with its feet planted firmly on the ground and sent us soaring into the air and then into the heavens, just two ordinary Americans, the Wright brothers.

One segment of our population, Black Americans, have been prolific inventors, men like Jan Matzeliger, a former slave who invented a machine used in shoe manufacturing. It was Matzeliger who, protected by a patent, brought down the cost of shoes for an entire population. Before this man made his invention and put it to work in the shoe industry, most Americans had one pair of shoes for their entire life.

There is also George Washington Carver, a world-respected scientist and inventor, and so many more Black Americans. Why? Because in that era, when Blacks were discriminated against, we actually respected the rights of technology ownership of Black inventors. Thus they excelled when their rights were protected. And America and the world were better for it.

Our technological superiority provided us with prosperity that has also kept us safe. We cannot match the tyrants and the gangsters man for man because they don't care if they lose their own people. We must beat down our competitors and our enemies with superior technology, or we will lose, and our people will suffer as a result.

Bad policies put us in our current economic crisis. Tonight I warn of a huge policy shift that is making its way through this twisted legislative path into law. If the legislation I am warning about tonight passes in both Houses of Congress and is signed into law, the legal protections for our innovators and innovations that have made such a difference in America will be greatly diminished, if not destroyed. So take this as a fellow patriot sounding the alarm.

Tonight I would like to speak about something that would be devastating, another awesome threat. Yet there is a blase attitude here, and one would think that this is just a minor, if not irrelevant, issue. The fundamental changes being proposed in our patent law will have a huge impact on our lives and will dramatically alter the lives of our children for the worst.

Tonight I seek to alert my fellow Americans just how significant this issue is to their jobs, their prosperity and, yes, their safety. The so-called Patent Reform Act of 2009, H.R. 1260, is a bill that is not new to these Halls. It is nearly duplicative of legislation that

has been introduced time and again. Each time a small group of patriots, and I'm proud to have been among them, has managed to defeat the multinational corporations who are behind this legislative lunacy. But they keep coming back. They have got deep pockets.

So here we go again, to fight the same fight over nearly the same bill. But if we lose it just once, the fundamental protections of our technology rights will be lost forever. There is no going back if we lose because this is an attempt to tie us, we, the American people, to "international commitments" rather than to constitutional protections.

Stick with me on this.

America's economic adversaries are engaged in a systematic attack on our well-being, and thus they have noticed one of the strongest and most important elements of our country's success has been the patent protection enjoyed by our people. That is what this so-called patent "reform" is all about. It is not reform, but it is about the destruction of our basic system which has served us so well.

This crime in progress is being pushed by huge multinational corporations with little or no loyalties to our country or our people. The justification for this attack on our patent system, as I say, a patent system that has served us so well, the justification, the proponents claim, our patent system is so different that it must be harmonized with the rest of the world. Get this: we have to weaken the protection of our technology ownership rights to harmonize our laws with the rest of the world. Our laws are, in fact, substantially different. So harmonization means dramatic changes in our system. In the end, that will change the lives of our people. And the change will be for the worst.

The corporate elitists who are pushing this consider themselves globalists. They are not watching out for us. In this battle over so-called patent "reform," their goal is not reforming, but diminishing the legal protections for Americans, for American inventors. This in the name of harmonizing with the rest of the world our inventors will be made vulnerable to those who would rob them and thus rob America of the advantage that we have been given due to this strong patent protection.

This is what gives us the advantage, our technological advantage, against overseas competition. That will be taken from us. If America is to be prosperous, if we are to be secure in the future, we must take on our own corporate elites who would change the rules to our detriment but perhaps to their short-term gain.

Those playing the sinister game are, of course, not saying that they are out to destroy the patent system. Well, they act aghast when confronted with this suggestion. But from a distance, it is clear. Here is an article in the China Intellectual Property News about last

year's legislation that, as I say, is a bill that almost totally mirrored the current bill that is going through Congress. They are almost the same bill.

This analysis was written by a former senior judge and deputy presiding judge, two of them, of the intellectual property division of Beijing's High People's Court, whom I now quote: "The bill is friendlier to the infringers than to the patentees in general as it will make the patent less reliable, easier to be challenged, and cheaper to be infringed. It is not bad news for developing countries which have fewer patents."

Then the authors who are writing this article asked, Why is it that the United States is making it easier to violate the intellectual property rights of our people while at the same time trying to convince China and others to respect the intellectual property rights of Americans? He asked that question in this article. Now, that is from a senior Chinese scholar about the legislation that we stopped last year, and that legislation was almost the same as what we are facing this year.

□ 2130

Certainly none of his criticisms are different for this year's bill than what they were for last year's bill.

Mr. Speaker, it's estimated that the U.S. economy loses \$250 billion a year from global intellectual property theft, and that does not take into account the jobs that are lost here when China and other countries steal and use our technology to compete with our own companies and put our own people out of work. That loss is billions and billions more.

Now, that's under current law they're able to steal that and use our technology against us. That's not under the watered-down system which will result from the so-called reform bill which is now being considered here on Capitol Hill. This at a time when our country can ill afford such a drain. We are trying to change our laws so that it will make it easier for foreigners to steal our technology and use it against us.

Yet, those pushing the so-called patent reform legislation are making our innovators and research industries even more vulnerable to such blatant theft, even though we are now in a time of economic hardship. Foreign firms in India and China and elsewhere are getting ready to pounce.

When looking at the general state of America's patent system, and that's what we're doing tonight, we need to admit, and I will fully admit, there are lots of flaws in our patent system and, yes, there are problems in our patent system that need to be addressed.

We hear of horror stories concerning companies that are tied up for years in court. We hear about examiners who are undertrained and overworked, and that's absolutely true. They aren't getting the training they need and they are not getting the pay they deserve.

There are delays and our innovators could use some help in protecting

themselves from foreign thieves and infringers. So we have got some problems with our patent system that need to be addressed.

But that has nothing to do with H.R. 1260, the bill now making its way through Congress. Everyone assumes that a bill entitled Patent Reform would be doing that, would be correcting the problems of the patent system. The title of this bill is so fraudulent that if it were a product, it would be banned from the market for making false claims.

This bogus reform bill has visited us before. As I say, it's come before. We've had these same multinational megacorporations trying to undermine the patent system. We've seen it time and again. But if it ever passes once, we're never going to be able to get these rights back.

A similar one was beaten back a dozen years ago, as well as another just a year ago. The same crowd that was behind those inventors' nightmares is behind this year's anti-inventor foray. Let's put it this way: They are powerful, multinational electronics companies with no allegiance to Americans or America. Let me just note that some of these companies, for example, have had situations in China where they ended up working with the Chinese dictatorship utilizing their computer systems to track down dissidents and to stamp out people who are struggling for freedom in that country. On our side—so that's the people who are trying to reform America's patent system.

On our side, well, we're just a ragtag group of legislative insurgents trying to stop this incredible change to the fundamental rights of our people. MARCY KAPTUR, a Congresswoman on the other side of the aisle and a fine friend and a wonderful Member of Congress, with little help from STENY HOYER, again, now a leader on that other side of the aisle, along with DON MANZULLO and JOHN CAMPBELL of California and myself and just a few others, we were able to fight that good fight over the years.

But no one thought we had a chance because we didn't have any of the big money behind us. We didn't have these multinational corporations. We didn't have the high-priced lobbyists who go to the Judiciary Committee year after year giving donations to the members of the Judiciary Committee in order to get this bill out in the form they want. No one thought that we had a chance because they already laid the foundation with all of their campaign donations and all of their influence in Washington. Well, so we were told even before it was brought up, you don't have a chance. Forget it.

We labeled their Trojan horse legislation, this antipatent legislation, we labeled it the Steal American Technologies Act. Again, it wasn't—these bills that we have defeated in the past are not that much different than what we have before us today. Well, that

Steal American Technologies Act, that label stuck, and it worked, with a little help from talk radio.

And then, also confirming that democracy really works, David beat Goliath. Yes, we, the small group of independent Members of the House, working together on both sides of the aisle, we won. And that means the American people won. Clearly, by the outcome, this wasn't a Democrat or a Republican issue. It was an American issue. The patriots beat the globalists.

Now, we have another attempt, very similar to the ones that we have beat in the past is being made now. It's working its way through the system in the name of harmonizing American patent law with the rest of the world. It's still here. We defeated it in the years past. If we don't win this time, all of these patent rights we've enjoyed will be lost forever because they're trying to tie this in to international agreements rather than the U.S. Constitution.

But, as I said, when they come back, the big companies that were pushing this have deep pockets and they're able to come back, but we who opposed it need the support of the American people if we are to win this battle with Goliath this year.

So here we go again. It's H.R. 1260. People should remember that number. It is the son of the Steal American Technologies Act. It contains all of those provisions that we hated so much. That bill has already passed through the United States Senate. It should be considered a primary threat to our freedom at this moment. The globalists, the corporate thieves and the looters behind this bill are intent to get it through and they will not give up. They must be defeated instead, and that won't happen on its own.

Those of us who are fighting the battle here in the House and in the Senate, we must act in coordination with the American people. The American people need to get involved or we lose.

What are some of the specifics that back up my charge that this bill undermines patent protection rather than reforms the system, as we are told?

Well, this first glaring issue is that the bill changes a fundamental concept that has always been part of American patent law which is differentiated from the other patent laws around the world. And that one element, the most important concept, is that it is the person who actually invents something who is the one who will get the patent and have the rights of ownership of that technology. The one who actually invents something.

Other countries have patents that are based on who managed to file for a patent first; in other words, who got to the paperwork, who could hire the lawyer, who managed to bribe the official or managed to understand the deadlines better, not who invented the technology, who filed the paperwork first. And this is as compared to our system where people who actually invent new technology have the right to own it.

The legislation now making its way through Congress changes our current system from first to invent, which is what it's been all these years from our country's founding, to what is called first to file. If put into law, any new application or action will be needed every time there's a little step forward in research. Any time one is going towards an eventual goal, even one step, there's going to be new paperwork demanded, new action, new applications to be filled out, rather than waiting for the goal to be achieved, waiting for the entire invention to actually be complete, so that it can be incorporated into a patent.

Well, because so many more patent applications are required now, if we make this change, to provide exactly the same protection, there will be a major new cost of getting a patent. Well, the little guys aren't going to be able to afford that cost. Well, the big guys can afford it. The major companies who have lots of lawyers working for them, they'll be able to afford that. The little guy will be frozen out. That's the intent of the legislation. That's what they want to do.

The massive new flood of paperwork into the Patent Office is also a doomsday scenario that is bound to make the Patent Office less effective in doing its basic job, which is protecting the patent rights of our people. That is the intent of the legislation, to basically make the Patent Office less effective, not more effective. So the little guy will get frozen out and the system becomes less manageable because you have all kinds of new paper to be dealing with.

Those powerful interests pushing this so-called harmonization know very well what the results will be. This isn't a mistake in communication. They know what they're doing. They already steal what they can from the little guys, and this will make it easier for them to steal from the little guys. It looks benevolent. It sounds benevolent, patent reform, but this is a sinister, sinister bill. It will destroy rights that the American people have had since the founding of our country and have had so much to do with our prosperity and our security.

Well, then, in this legislation, there is a pre-grant and post-grant review section. The bill opens up new avenues of attack before and after a patent application has been acted upon. For example, a patent applicant has applied for an overseas patent, and if he does, it opens him up to attack even before his patent is issued here in the United States.

This pre-grant opposition helps only the big guys, only the infringers and the looters. It hurts the little guys. And that's the intent of the law. That's why the change is being proposed. That's why they're pushing this law, because it hurts the little guys, and the big guys are pushing the bill.

Then the bill also contains a newly invigorated post-grant review, which

means yet another avenue to challenge patents after they've actually been granted, bogging down the system, increasing inventor costs, undermining legitimate inventors, and opening the door to foreign and multinational corporations who are all ready, they're ready to pounce to take advantage of yet another post-grant review of the patent.

For those of you in the know, the post-grant review is a totally unnecessary change, a nonlegislative reform in the interparties' reexamination, a reform that has already taken place, has taken care of any problem that this new legislation claims to address. So the problem that they were suggesting that would take care of has already been addressed through several court cases and internal reform. So the need for a post-grant review change is moot, unless, of course, your goal is to complicate the system, to bog it down so it doesn't work, which is the intent of the bill.

Reform that enables large companies, foreigners, and other infringers to attack our inventors again and again and add horrifying costs to the process is not reform.

And it is not just foreigners who are licking their chops. As I say, there are multinational corporations that are ready that may be headed by Americans who think of themselves as citizens of the world. They're ready.

But also, we've got, actually, companies that are ready to assist people who try to violate the little guy's patents rights. "Patent Assassin," that's a quote, "Patent Assassin" is a California company that is ready to help potential infringers, and I quote from their Web site. "You can easily infiltrate an existing patent while greatly reducing your company's patent infringement risk."

H.R. 1260 will only provide more tools for organizations like this and foreign companies, as well as major international corporations, to destroy the rights of inventors that they have enjoyed in this country since the founding of our country.

You know, when you look at the patent bill, much of it is not changing the way the patent system works, but, instead, changing litigation, so the way litigation is. This will be a tremendous boost for lawyers who are seeking to use their skills to take something away from someone who owns a little piece of property that he thought that he put his whole life into.

□ 2145

So, through H.R. 1260, we will add all sorts of new ways to attack America's inventors. The big guys don't care. They've got lots of lawyers working for them. The big guys will be able to beat down the little guys, Americans, just like the little guys in Japan are beaten down by the economic shoguns.

By the way, in Japan, that's why there are so few really groundbreaking inventions. Japan has a totally dif-

ferent system than ours. Their patent system favors the mega-corporations at the expense of the little guy. In fact, the Japanese system is what they want to harmonize our system with. Those rights are protected here in the United States by our Constitution and by the way our system works. In Japan, their people are vulnerable.

Do we really want to be like those people in Japan?

No, we don't want to harmonize the strong legal protections of our citizens with the weak legal protections in Japan and in other countries of the world. We don't want Americans to be like the Japanese. We want Americans who are individuals, who are proud of their individual rights, not people who cower before powerful interest groups as they do in Japan. Foreign companies and American-run multinational firms are ready to squash the little guy. That's what this bill is all about, and we've got to stop them.

Another example of the real threat of H.R. 1260 is it would make it more difficult for a patent owner to get triple damages against an infringer who brazenly ignores the patent owner's rights and uses his invention, even knowing he is stealing it, without offering to pay a royalty. Without triple damages, which is what someone gets now—the inventor will get triple damages against a big company that just willfully takes his patent rights and refuses to pay him a royalty. Without triple damages, these little guys won't be able to get the lawyers to work for them on a contingency, which is the only way that someone who is a little guy and who has been wronged by a huge multinational corporation, is going to be able to have any chance of winning. Only big companies with lawyers on staff will be able to protect their patents. Nobody else will be able to because the little guy, without triple damages there to help pay for the lawyer, won't be able to get a lawyer to work with him. Giant foreign and multinational companies versus individual American inventors: If they win, we lose. If this bill passes, America loses.

Eliminating the right to triple damages is still in the House version of this so-called reform bill. This absurdly bad provision is not in the Senate bill, but until that bill appears in a final form from the conference committee and is voted for on the House floor and on the Senate floor in its final version, that provision can stay in. We have no idea whether that provision will stay in, as is in the House version, or will be taken out, as is in the Senate version.

It's not just triple damages, but it's also how the damages themselves will be calculated, which is yet another avenue of attack on the little guy by the big guys in this so-called patent reform bill.

The electronics industry is arguing that any payment for patent infringement, which is the only penalty that can be paid—meaning if they stole somebody's idea and put it into their

computer—must reflect what percentage it is of that which they have stolen of the entire device or end product. Thus, a mega-corporation will intentionally infringe because stealing is going to be a lot easier than will negotiating a price with the inventor. If someone is stealing someone else's invention, it basically eliminates someone's right to negotiate that price, and if the damages can only be equal to a small percentage of the device in which it's placed, the corporation will do that—will steal it—rather than negotiate a royalty agreement.

This is an invitation to steal. This totally destroys the inventor's right to negotiate the price for his property. Combine that with the increased difficulties in claiming what "willfulness" is in that they're trying to make it more difficult to prove that someone has intentionally stolen someone's property. This means that the infringers who have intended to steal technology and who have done so with an arrogant disregard for the small patentholder will get away with their crimes, and the patentholder will be left with a minuscule award, so minuscule that he won't be able to hire legal services to help him assert his rights to the properties that he has created.

This is in total violation of what our Constitution was all about. Our Constitution was about protecting that man's right to his inventions and to his discoveries. That's what it says in the Constitution, but this bill is going through, and it will have a dramatic impact on our way of life. If made law, this will kill any chance for individuals to hire legal muscle needed to enforce one's patent rights against corporate or foreign theft.

So, yes, we've got mega-corporations run by people who don't consider themselves patriots, but foreign corporations will have that same power. They'll use our technology against us. The inventor who may have struggled for years to discover and to develop the invention, who might have even invested his life savings, will be at the mercy of foreign and corporate thieves. Punishing the large multinational corporations for malfeasance, or for intended theft, which is what happens today when these companies steal from the little guy, will be a thing of the past. That's what the big guys want. They don't want to get away with murder, but they want to get away with just about everything else.

That's what this so-called patent reform is all about. It is clear the so-called patent reform bill is designed to help the law breaker—the big guns—and to hurt the little guy. It helps foreign infringers and it hurts Americans. It's the patriots versus the globalists. All of this—the shift to first to file, pre- and post-grant review, changes to basic willfulness, and calculable damages—really amounts to more than harmonization, doesn't it? We're not just talking about harmonizing with the rest of the world. When you put all of this together, what do you get?

The electronic mega-companies behind the scurrilous legislation have labeled themselves the so-called “coalition for patent fairness.” What do they want to do? It’s very clear. They don’t want patents at all. They would be much better off if we rid our country and the world of the idea of patents all together. It’s just too bothersome for them, and so to hell with all the others—the inventors, the green-collar jobs, the biotechnology, the pharmaceuticals, our university research programs—all of which have a profound dependence on a strong patent system. These high-tech and mega-electronics corporations say they can just go to hell. All of these will suffer by this so-called reform legislation. So big electronics is thumping its nose at America, and it thinks it can get away with it.

All of the rest of us, all of these other interests in our society—the universities and the biotechs and other interests which rely on patents and the pharmaceutical industry which pumps so much money into research—will just have their research stolen from them by foreign corporations.

Look at the main proponents of H.R. 1260. Now, I won’t name who the main proponents are of H.R. 1260. I won’t name them—they’re these mega-electronics companies—but they are made up of only one narrow sector of the entire American industry. These companies got to the top by using aggressive business models that, at best, put them into the gray area. Now that they are on top, they want to change the rules so they can stay up on top by keeping others down.

Let me say that just a few more than a dozen of these companies that are behind this legislation—a few more than a dozen—have faced hundreds of lawsuits for infringement in the past decade. From 1996–2008, these very companies that are at the heart of the coalition, who are pushing for this destructive legislation, were defendants in 730 patent infringement cases and paid out almost \$4 billion in patent infringement settlements during the same period.

So no wonder they want to change the rules. No wonder they want to destroy the patent system. By coming here and giving people campaign donations and by spending all of this money in promoting this monstrous bill, it costs them a lot less money to change the law than it does for them to have to pay for the infringement and to have to pay for the crimes against these small inventors. They want to make sure that, actually, they will be able to steal the product of other people’s work, of these small inventors in our country. Actually, it will pay them to do so rather than to try to work out an understanding of where that person could be paid a royalty, which is what they should be paid when they own a piece of intellectual property.

Well, we don’t work for these big companies. We work for our families,

for our communities, and we work for America. We are the patriots. We are not the globalists. Most of the corporate elites of those mega-firms see themselves as citizens of the world, while we are Americans. The changes in this bill are designed to help a few hugely rich companies, and it will devastate hundreds more.

Dozens and, indeed, hundreds of organizations have expressed outright opposition or deep concern with this bill. They are telling Congress do not favor one narrow industry simply because it has been so active and has been involved with pushing this legislation. Do what is best for America. We need the American people to tell that to their Representatives and to let their Representatives know that they are watching what goes on with patent law.

The big corporate thieves are depending on us to be so bored with the issue. “Oh, I’m just going to tune it out because it sounds like it’s boring, and I couldn’t understand it.” That’s what they’re relying on. Well, it’s not too boring, and people can understand it. People should understand how important it has been that our country has had the strongest patent protection of any country on this planet, just as we have had the same and strongest protection for the other rights—for our freedom of speech, for our freedom of religion and for other rights.

What would happen if, in order to harmonize the freedom that we enjoy with the rest of the world—the freedom of religion and the freedom of speech—we were told that our protections of these freedoms would have to be diminished because we would have to diminish the protections of freedom of speech, of assembly and of religion because they need to be harmonized with the rest of the world? Well, the uproar would sweep across our country, but the deletion of this right, the diminishing of patent protection, seems so esoteric to most people that they won’t even listen. But if we don’t listen and if we don’t get involved, the big guns will think that they can slip it over on us. They’ve been trying to do that for 15 years. Only a small group of us has been able to stand up, but we need the help of the American people.

We need the American people to speak up. We need people to call talk radio. We need people to confront their own Members of Congress. We need to tell the powerful infringers, You are not going to diminish the rights of the American people in order to harmonize the law internationally. The patriots in this country are not going to see their rights diminished in order to create a new world order where we can all live in harmony with the rest of the world, which, of course, is run by gangsters and thugs—half of the rest of the world. We’re not going to act like people in the rest of the world where we let the elite tell us what to do. We have constitutional rights. We are Americans, but it’s up to us to protect those rights.

Wake up, America. Our freedom is being threatened. Every generation has met the challenges, and now it is up to us—us, United States, U.S. It is up to us.

Well, we are on the edge right now. We are on the edge on a lot of things. Our economy is going down. This could be the nail in the coffin. If this bill passes, it will have dramatic, negative, long-term effects on our economy and on the well-being and prosperity of our people. We need to act. Wake up, America.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for July 13.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 13 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. UPTON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for July 13 on account of family commitments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCMAHON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 20 and 21.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 20 and 21.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, July 20.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, July 15, 16 and 17.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HIMES, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 15, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2627. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mandipropamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0461; FRL-8422-5] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2628. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indoxacarb; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0271; FRL-8424-9] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2629. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Buprofezin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0589; FRL-8421-3] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2630. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2-Propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, polymers with Bu acrylate, Et acrylate, Me methacrylate and polyethylene glycol methacrylateC16-18-alkyl ethers; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0256; FRL-8422-3] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2631. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyazofamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0731; FRL-8423-5] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2632. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — d-Phenothrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0140; FRL-8417-4] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2633. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dodecanedioic acid, 1, 12-dihydrazide and Thiophene, 2,5-dibromo-3-hexyl-; Significant New Use Rules [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2006-0898; FRL-8398-5] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2634. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polyglyceryl Phthalate Ester of Coconut Oil Fatty Acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0888; FRL-8423-1] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2635. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyrimethanil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0478; FRL-8423-6] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2636. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium 1,4-Dialkyl Sulfosuccinates; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0739; FRL-8423-2] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2637. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-B-1044] received June 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2638. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Ireland pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2639. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Egypt pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2640. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Small Electric Motors [Docket No.: EERE-2008-BT-TP-0008] (RIN: 1904-AB71) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2641. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County, Continuous Opacity Monitor Regulation [EPA-R03-OAR-2009-0352; FRL-8929-2] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2642. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the 1-Hour Ozone Plan for the Beaumont/Port Arthur Area; Control of Air Pollution from Volatile Organic Compounds, Nitrogen Compounds, and Reasonably Available Control Technology [EPA-R06-OAR-2005-TX-0005; FRL-8928-6] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2643. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [VA201-5202; FRL-8923-9] received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2644. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) Clarification of April 30, 2009, Addendum to Supplemental Funding for Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) Grantees [FRL-8925-6] received July 2, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2645. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-29, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2646. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 09-24, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2647. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2648. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2008 through March 31, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2649. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the 2008 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2650. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act Inventory Summary as of June 30, 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2651. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2009 Monkfish Research Set-Aside Program [Docket No.: 080626787-8788-01] (RIN: 0648-XP54) received July 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2652. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2008 report to Congress on the "The Status of U.S. Fisheries," pursuant to Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2653. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the first of five reports required by Section 1201(c) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) detailing the Department's progress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2654. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2009-22, waiving the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402; (H. Doc. No. 111-57); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 1622. A bill to provide for a program of research, development, and demonstration on natural gas vehicles; with an amendment (Rept. 111-206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 2729. A bill to authorize the designation of National Environmental Research Parks by the Secretary of Energy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 644. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3170) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-208). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. MATSUI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 645. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3183) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-209). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 3195. A bill to create a National Home Mortgage and Loan Performance Registry to maintain an inventory of the supply and performance of home mortgage loans in the United States to show market trends and dynamics in the mortgage lending industry and provide detailed information on national mortgage foreclosure rates; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3196. A bill to impose limitations on investment and certain operations by foreign entities in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3197. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to provide grants to local educational agencies to conduct demonstration projects to screen the blood pressure of children in kindergarten through grade 6; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3198. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide international wildlife management and conservation programs through the Wildlife Without Borders Program in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself, Ms. BEAN, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN):

H.R. 3199. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to State emergency medical service departments to provide for the expedited training and licensing of veterans with prior medical training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 3200. A bill to provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans and reduce the growth in health care spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the General Mining Law to provide for a fair return to the public, security of tenure to holders of mining claims and mill sites, and cleanup of abandoned mine lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3202. A bill to establish a Water Protection and Reinvestment Fund to support investments in clean water and drinking water infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 3203. A bill to promote remediation of inactive and abandoned mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 3204. A bill to authorize States and localities receiving assistance under the Neighborhood Stabilization Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to use such amounts for renovating owner-occupied housing of low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3205. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny any deduction for advertising health insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina):

H.R. 3206. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require a national primary drinking water regulation for perchlorate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross in-

come gain on the sale of certain residential leased-fee interests to holders of the leasehold rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARCURI (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 3208. A bill to fully compensate local educational agencies and local governments for tax revenues lost when the Federal Government takes land into trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe or an individual Indian; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 3209. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make the killing of a law enforcement officer, firefighter, or other first responder an aggravating factor for the imposition of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. WALTERS):

H.R. 3210. A bill to authorize appropriations for the rural housing and economic development program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KAGEN:

H.R. 3211. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the percentage increase applied to benefits each year as a cost-of-living increase under such title shall in no case be less than the percentage increase in compensation of Members of Congress specified for such year under section 31 of title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3212. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and reduce the occurrence of sudden unexpected infant death and to enhance public health activities related to stillbirth; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and make permanent the standard deduction for real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3214. A bill to provide for credit rating reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3215. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service Superintendent of the Everglades National Park, to allow individuals to hunt and kill Burmese pythons within the boundaries of that Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the retransmission of signals of local television broadcast stations in an adjacent underserved county, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mrs. BACHMANN):

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3218. A bill to provide a refundable tax credit for medical costs, to expand access to health insurance coverage through individual membership associations (IMAs), and to assist in the establishment of high risk pools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE:

H. Res. 640. A resolution electing a Minority Member to a standing committee; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BILL-RAKIS):

H. Res. 641. A resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the founding of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. Res. 642. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to legislation relating to changes in our Nation's health care system; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. Res. 643. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any major health care reform bill considered on the floor should be available for viewing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. MICA):

H. Res. 646. A resolution honoring the memory and lasting legacy of Sally Crowe; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 647. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Save for Retirement Week", including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. STARK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BACA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOGETT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. KAGEN):

H. Res. 648. A resolution expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of potential health affects posed by mercury; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

103. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 26 urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to oppose legislation that is detrimental to the rights of workers and is an offense against democratic principles by opposing the Employee Free Choice Act and any of its components in 2009 and in future years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

104. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Chapter 171. An Act memorializing the President and Congress to repeal the federal legislation of 1863 ordering the removal of Dakota people from Minnesota; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 108: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 197: Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 433: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 442: Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 468: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 482: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 503: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 616: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 621: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 669: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 684: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 690: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 745: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 777: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 804: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 819: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 953: Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 983: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 988: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALZ, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1036: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 1051: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1067: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1074: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1179: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1182: Mr. TANNER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 1207: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 1215: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1220: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.
H.R. 1237: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KILROY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1255: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1283: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1298: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1314: Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARR, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1327: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLF, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 1346: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1362: Mr. DRIEHAUS.
H.R. 1389: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1441: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1454: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1458: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1526: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MATHESON, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1584: Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1589: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 1608: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1618: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 1670: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1685: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1719: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1751: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1776: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1826: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 1831: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. BARTLETT.
H.R. 1835: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1868: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1925: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1941: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1956: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1977: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2016: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 2017: Mr. TURNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 2026: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2135: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2139: Mr. MINNICK and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2190: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 2204: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 2215: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2245: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BONNER, Ms. BEAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NYE, Mr. SPACE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. SPIER.
H.R. 2251: Mr. FARR, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2254: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2262: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SABLON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 2269: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2293: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2329: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2365: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2382: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2406: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 2478: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2492: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2499: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2514: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2517: Mr. PETERS and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2542: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2558: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2560: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2594: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
H.R. 2607: Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 2632: Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 2639: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 2676: Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 2697: Mr. FARR and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2702: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 2720: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2733: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2753: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. PERRIELLO.
H.R. 2766: Mr. HODES and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2776: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2807: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2811: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2846: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 2866: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2896: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2941: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr.
H.R. 2946: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2969: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2987: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2989: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 2992: Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BONNER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2993: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 3006: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3017: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3025: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 3034: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3042: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 3043: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3093: Mr. GRAVES and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3119: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3144: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 3147: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3149: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3164: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3166: Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 3173: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER,

Mr. PETRI, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3174: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REHBERG, and Ms. FOXX.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. BAIRD.
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. TURNER.
H. Con. Res. 157: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H. Res. 346: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Res. 397: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H. Res. 455: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H. Res. 458: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 467: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. KILROY.
H. Res. 494: Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. BRIGHT.
H. Res. 496: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 517: Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SIREN, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. HIRONO.
H. Res. 554: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 558: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. REYES.
H. Res. 577: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 591: Mr. LEE of New York.
H. Res. 593: Mr. HONDA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WU, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. REYES, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California,

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H. Res. 607: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H. Res. 613: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. ARCURI.
H. Res. 615: Mr. CARTER.
H. Res. 619: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 630: Mr. RUSH and Mr. MASSA.
H. Res. 631: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 634: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MCGOVERN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative SERRANO of New York, or a designee, to H.R. 3170, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2010, contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative PASTOR of Arizona, or a designee, to H.R. 3183, the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

60. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Family and the Aging Services Foundation, Inc. (Formerly Filial Piety Society), relative to a request for funding; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.